The Forum

OCTOBER, 1898.

ENGLAND AND RUSSIA IN THE FAR EAST.

THE relations of England and Russia in the Far East attract the attention of every thinking man and woman at the present time; but it would be a cardinal error to imagine that the drama now being enacted in China will amount to more than a chapter in the world-wide struggle which will in the long run take place between the two empires. Great Britain did indeed guarantee the integrity of the Chinese Empire early in the present year, as far as a resolution of the House of Commons goes; but Great Britain has guaranteed in a far more solemn fashion the integrity of the Turkish Empire in Asia by the Cyprus Convention of 1878, as also she guaranteed the integrity of the Kingdom of Sweden and Norway by the treaty to which France was a party in 1855.

British interests clash with those of Russia not only in China, but also on the northwest frontier of India, in Persia, in Abyssinia, in Southeastern and even in Central Europe. Great Britain has now to make up her mind not what her policy in China is, but what her policy will be whenever and wherever she meets Russia in the gate. We are face to face with a young nation, a vigorous nation, a nation whose religious and political beliefs centre in one man whose advisers can direct the whole power of the Empire at any time on any foe with all the force of a crusade. The struggle will be one not only for our daily bread, but also for existence itself. Freedom of thought and freedom of conscience are involved no less than political and commercial freedom. What wonder if the whole civilized world looks with anxiety on a contest in which its progress is so deeply concerned?

Copyright, 1897, by The Forum Publishing Company.
Permission to republish articles is reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The immediate stake is the trade, as yet little developed, of the Chinese Empire, with its three hundred and fifty millions of thrifty, industrious people. The geographical features of that empire are familiar to every one. It falls into four great natural divisions made by its river systems. Beginning in the south, there is the West River, which flows into the China Sea near the English colony of Hong Kong. In the centre there is the Yangtse-Kiang, the great river which forms a connecting link between China and the English possessions in Burma, and near the mouth of which is situated Shanghai, the commercial capital of China. Toward the north there is the Yellow River, which flows through Shantung into the Gulf of Pechili; and, last, there is the Peiho and its tributaries, in the basin of which Peking, the political capital of the Empire, is situated.

Roughly speaking, the provinces north of Peking have come to be regarded as the sphere of Russian interest. Shantung has been defined as the German sphere of interest. England claims the Yangtse Valley, including the country south as far as the West River; while south of the West River lies the sphere of France. Russia alone has effectively occupied her sphere, Manchuria, with troops.

So far, the object of the English Government has been to maintain the integrity of China and to prevent a partition such as the acknowledgment and delimitation of spheres of interest would imply; and English diplomatists have been inclined to believe that they could by this means obtain equality of opportunity, or what is called "the open door," for English trade throughout the Chinese Empire. The extent of those interests and the possibility of realizing that programme are what we have to consider.

The total value of British goods annually imported into China is twenty-seven and one-half millions sterling. British ships carry 82 per cent of the total trade of the Chinese Empire, and pay 76 per cent of the total customs levied. On the Yangtse, which we claim as our special sphere of interest, according to the last return, 64.8 per cent of the shipping is British, 23.1 per cent is Chinese, and only 12.1 per cent belongs to other Powers. No less than 1,690 British steamers, aggregating 2,252,909 tons burden, entered the river in the last recorded year; and almost the same amount of British tonnage cleared.

It is a commonplace that England lives by trade, and that it is only in the East and specially in the Far East that we can still hope to create and maintain open markets for British manufactures. How does Russia treat our traders? A well-known traveller has stated that every port, every town, every village which passes into French or Russian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hands is an outlet closed to Manchester, Bradford, and Bombay. We may add that a prohibitive duty of from 25 to 30 per cent is laid by Russia on all English goods, including precisely those iron-manufactures which are most likely to be in request for the construction of railways and the opening up of a new country. The policy of Russia toward British capital has been shown by its exclusion in the case of the railway to New-chwang, in the Russian sphere, no less than by Russian opposition to the proposed loan from the British Bank of Persia to the Persian Government.

It is not only our trade and our capital, but also British shipping and British subjects, that Russia seeks to exclude. A Russian law has been passed, which comes into force in 1900, under which goods forwarded between Russian ports, whether in Europe or the Far East, must be carried in Russian ships. The only exception is with regard to salt carried between Russian ports on the Baltic and the Black Sea. A further law has been enacted, also coming into force in 1900, under which only Russian sailors may be employed in Russian ships; and it will be remembered what efforts have been made by Russia to exclude British engineers from Manchuria, and how the lighthouse-keepers employed by the Chinese Customs under Sir Robert Hart have been dismissed in the Russian sphere of interest.

It is well to recollect that, although at the present time these regulations are directed against British interests, they will be equally galling to American enterprise; and one may lay stress in passing on the date 1900. It has been hoped that by 1900 the Siberian Railway would be completed. Till 1900 the Persian Government is forbidden by treaty with Russia to construct railways in Persia. It is expected that by 1900 the Russian arsenal at Ekaterina on the coast of Lapland will be completed, and threaten every British port from Aberdeen to London. It was at one time believed that by 1900 the railway communication between Tornea, on the Baltic, and Port Victoria, the ice-free port on the Atlantic Ocean, in Norwegian territory, would be finished; and for Port Victoria the fate of Port Arthur has been predicted in the Swedish Parliament. Yet there are those who say that Russian statesmen are incapable of planning a forward movement on more than one point at a given date.

But it may be asked, Has Russia taken any steps to place her traders at an advantage in China, and what proof can be given that deep-laid Russian designs have been masked by what is called Russian duplicity? Take the case of Port Arthur. According to Article I of the Russo-Chi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nese Convention concluded early in the present year, "The sovereign right of China shall not be infringed by the lease of Port Arthur and Talien-wan." Yet Russian merchants at Odessa have been informed that Port Arthur is considered a Russian port and that Russian goods will be admitted free of duties to which British goods will be subject. Port Arthur has been declared a Russian naval fortress of the second class; Rear-Admiral Stark, the second in command of the Russian Pacific squadron, has been appointed commandant; and a garrison of 12,000 Russian troops has been placed at that point. Finally, the Chinese Government has been notified that only Chinese ships commanded by Russian officers will be admitted there; and a circular has been sent from the Russian Legation at Peking to the representatives of the other Powers, announcing the order of the Russian Government that Russian passport regulations will be enforced there. In face of this it seems immaterial to record what were the successive assurances given by Russia to the British Government about Port Arthur; for assurances have not the solemn character of a convention.

After these indications of Russian policy in actual fact it may be interesting to turn to a declaration of Russian policy by Prince Uchtomsky. Prince Uchtomsky is president of the Russo-Chinese Bank, which is playing so large a part in Russian commercial policy in China; he was chief of the last Russian special mission to Peking; he accompanied the present Czar on his journey to the Far East, and remains one of the Czar's close personal friends and counsellors. Further, he is editor of the St. Petersburg "Viedomosti," and, as such, is directly under the control of the Russian Government.

Prince Uchtomsky has made an authoritative pronouncement to a well-known German traveller, for publication in the principal German magazine, with the avowed purpose of gaining the support of the German public. By the way, in return for such support, Germany is to receive among other things a free hand for colonial expansion in South America, to which the United States may perhaps have something to say. The Prince states that the objects of Russia are, first, to absorb China under the ægis of the present dynasty, second, to exclude British industry, and, third, to form a Continental alliance to crush Great Britain. A few sentences in the final paragraph in the review sum up the matter:

"The pith of the Prince's ideas is the overthrow of England. Obviously he has a war in view, and that in the near future. The removal of English competition from the field is necessary to enable Russia to offer us [Germany] a preferential position in China from a commercial point of view. So soon as England is eliminated from the rivalry of the nations in Eastern Asia, it becomes quite a secondary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question for us whether we [Germany] should barter Shantung to Russia for a position, say, in the Yangtse Valley."

Whatever the personal views of the Czar may be, it is at least permissible to say that these opinions, so openly expressed by a person in Prince Uchtomsky's position, reveal the true state of affairs in the Far East from the point of view of the Czar's advisers. Germany has forced Russia's hand by the occupation of Kiao Chou, which Prince Uchtomsky considers to be in Russia's sphere of interest. Russia has been compelled to move sooner than she desired, and has her hands too full to wish to move further just now. Meanwhile Great Britain is contemptuously told by the Russian press that Russia will not menace her interests, now that she has got what she wants.

On the political results of the absorption of Manchuria by Russia it is unnecessary to comment. In addition to a splendid naval position practically on the Pacific, Russia has obtained a rich and undeveloped country in a temperate climate, peopled by the pick of the Chinese race, who are capable of forming an admirable army. One of her diplomatists has stated that Russia will conquer China by railways; and, as her recent action in the case of more than one railway shows, she intends to move southward by means of railway concessions, building railways and organizing them with Russian soldiers. Apart from this fresh menace to India from another quarter it may be well to notice the results of such action on English colonies in Hong Kong, the Straits Settlements, the Malay Peninsula, and Burma, as thus described by Mr. Pickering in a recent book:

"In these countries and islands the backbone of the population, the source of revenue and prosperity, are the Chinese, of whom we have at least 750,000 adults, the majority of whom, leaving their families at home, are entirely at the mercy of the Powers which rule the Celestial Empire."

If Russia becomes paramount at Peking, Mr. Pickering feels certain that in case of war the Chinese of our colonies could be

"so manipulated, either by promises of rewards or threats of punishment to their families in China, that we should find it very difficult to keep down rebellion within and at the same defend our coaling-stations and most valuable colonies from attack."

Mr. Pickering has spent the greater part of his life in the Far East; he has occupied the important position of Protector of Chinese at Singapore; and, on the testimony of Sir Robert Hart, has enjoyed unique opportunities of becoming acquainted with all classes and languages of the Chinese. His views are therefore entitled to consideration.

What, then, is the policy which must be adopted in the Far East?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England cannot of course hope to obtain the whole Chinese trade. She has never asked or wished for more than an equal opportunity with other nations over the whole Empire, which is known as "the open door." But the open door is gone in Manchuria and Shantung, and is threatened even in our own sphere of interest by railways such as that from Peking to Hankow, which is financed by the Russo-Chinese Bank. If we are to save the open door in the Yangtse Valley, it can be done only by instant interference. First, we must delimit our sphere, and make encroachment on it a *casus belli*. We must occupy certain commanding military positions so as to be able to exercise a controlling influence over the provincial Yamêns. Second, we must occupy the great water-ways and patrol them with gunboats, as we do the Persian Gulf. Third, we must undertake the construction of military and commercial railways; connecting our sphere with our possessions in Burma, and using public money if necessary. Last, we must organize a military and naval Chinese force.

All this seems to lead nearer and nearer to war with Russia; but that is not so. Lord Palmerston wrote in 1851:

> "The policy of Russia has always been to proceed with its conquests as rapidly as the apathy or want of firmness of other Governments permitted, but to retire if it encountered determined opposition, and then to await the next favorable opportunity to renew the onslaught on its intended victim."

Whatever might have been the case in 1900, had Germany not obtained a lease with sovereign rights of Kiao Chou, Russia is now unprepared for war with Great Britain. In the Far East she has neither the ships nor the men nor the means of transport necessary for such an undertaking. In Europe the transition to a gold currency and the expenses of the Siberian Railway make economies desirable. Further, at this moment Russian agriculture is in a parlous condition; and Russian land-owners will need help to tide over the present crisis. Russian industry has made marvellous strides in recent years, but requires still time for a peaceful development. It is even doubtful whether money can be found for the great Russian naval increase of the present year, which has led to corresponding effort on our own side. Time too is required for the successful advance of the Orthodox Greek Church in Persia, where it is driving English and American missionaries before it,—a significant omen for English and American missions in China. The same is true of the ever-growing Panslavist movement in Southeastern and in Central Europe.

The advisers of the Czar may well think, to use a phrase attributed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to a Russian, that for the present "they have bitten off more in the Far East than they can chew." Be that as it may, the course of Great Britain is clear. We must now draw a line round our possessions, and make the crossing of that line, as already said, a *casus belli*.

When other nations consider what the policy indicated means, it is possible that at any rate those not immediately interested will, one and all, wish us success. Within our sphere there will be found first and foremost not only justice, but also liberty—commercial, political, and religious liberty. And, looking at the results of our work in India, Egypt, and elsewhere, we need not fear to challenge the verdict even of the God of battles on the task which lies before us. GEOFFREY DRAGE.

P. S. The above was written before the publication of the Czar's manifesto of disarmament in to-day's newspapers. Whatever Powers may be affected by that remarkable utterance, Great Britain is not among them,—least of all as far as her relations with Russia are concerned. The Russian army contains on a peace footing a million soldiers. Great Britain, with a larger empire far more open to attack, could not put half that number into the field. The Russian navy, if we take into consideration the commercial interests it has to protect, is far larger *in proportion* than that of Great Britain. It is, in fact, purely aggressive; while that of Great Britain, from the mere insurance point of view, cannot be considered adequate.

As far as England and Russia are concerned, the only question an international conference could ask is, What reduction does Russia propose to make? It would be interesting to see how such proposals would be received, and how enforced. G. D.

LONDON, August 29, 1898.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE POPULIST CONCEIT—THE FREE COINAGE OF SILVER BY THE UNITED STATES ALONE.

BOTH the Chicago platform of the Democratic party and its 1896 Fusion Populist candidate for the Presidency appear to have become broken-winded in one campaign; and the candidate, as silver falls, dreads to feel that he too may drop and soon be wholly gone, unless the declension of silver can be arrested. Already the demand for silver-tongued oratory is slack. An honorarium of five hundred dollars for an hour of glib talk is no longer obtainable, even in Ohio.

The question in doubt is, whether the platform ruined the candidate, or the candidate ruined the platform. That both were ruined, appears to be now the fast-growing opinion, especially on the Pacific Slope, where Oregon, Washington, and California are getting as solid for sound money as they are for battleships in the next war.

The Wolcott Commission returned from abroad unable to obtain the coöperation of the leading nations in the restoration of the former value of silver. In the face of the unprecedented output of silver bullion, the task of creating a coextensive and stable demand for its coinage was of no ordinary magnitude. The attempt required courage, and had it. It required perseverance and rare ability; and it had both. If Europe, however, is unready for any action in relation to silver, the United States can wait for a century to come with as little discomfort as any country in the world. As a commodity, silver bullion, even at its present price, remunerates most of the Americans who are owners of silver-mines with better returns than are earned by tillers of the soil. Such mines as the Smuggler of Colorado, and the Anaconda of Montana, are not so likely to invite public sympathy on account of the poverty of their dividends as by the tough character conferred upon them by their names. Of silver as money the United States now holds the largest amount it ever had, with an appetite for more no longer rampant.

Should any silver coinage coöperation with foreign nations ever be consummated, we know, of course, that it must be on a wide change of the silver ratio, and at our great cost. Besides $97,000,000 of silver bullion on hand, we have $536,000,000 of silver coins in the Treasury,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or in circulation, worth far less than half their face value, to be recoined; and the shortage of silver supplied, or coined in a less amount, would have to be charged by the Government to profit and loss.

The annual output of silver of the United States so greatly exceeds that of other nations, that it is perhaps to be regretted that we have more than once been first in the field to propose the coördinate action of nations in behalf of its larger coinage, which may have aroused an ugly suspicion that our early inspiration was more commercial than cosmopolitan. Therefore, the future leadership of any such movement, if ever revived, would be better wholly surrendered to some country less encumbered by an annual output of silver.

The non-success of the various experiments made by the United States alone to increase the price of silver bullion, by its purchase and coinage, has been disastrously and sufficiently demonstrated; and the annual world-output has obviously become too excessive for consumption by the lagging demand for silver coinage. Manifestly the great owners of silver bullion must now accept its inferior commercial price, and welcome the moderate compensation offered by the increased demand for its use in the arts and manufactures.

Some of the integral parts of the Democratic party may be facile and slippery about the Silver Question in the present year, as their defeat appears inevitable; and, thereafter, expecting a divorce from the Populists, they will feel it an unlucky infelicity to have a Populist, even from Colorado, openly pat their backs. It is true that the advocates of unlimited silver coinage now nominally include it with the free coinage of gold, as though honestly working for it as part of their plan, though heretofore unmentioned; but no fox of a good family would accept a second invitation to dinner from the stork, after having learned, according to Æsop, that stork dinners were served in long-necked bottles, and never within reach of a fox. Gold will be brought to our mints for coinage on the half-price ratio of 16 to 1, and be as redundant as butter on bacon, only when gold is extracted from sea-water by the North Lubec Company, of Maine—but not till then.

The representatives of Silver politics, instead of admitting the fact of a more-than-50-per-cent depreciation of silver, often pretended that gold had doubled in value in consequence of diminished production. The claim is, however, wholly refuted by the report of the Director of the Mint, which shows that the annual output of gold has almost doubled since 1873. In nearly every gold-bearing country the product has increased; and this confutes the baseless charge that the scarcity of gold

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has augmented the burden of debtors. The sublimity of prevarication is attempted when it is charged that gold has fluctuated and grown so scarce that mortgage debts, since they were incurred, have been made far more grievous to bear; yet at no previous era has gold coin been so notably increased, so abundant, or so continuously maintained as contract and standard money by the United States or by the other leading nations as at the present time.

A further fact against the invalidity of the charge is, that the average duration of mortgage indebtedness has been ascertained to be less than three years, and the average duration of all other debts to be less than one year. At this brevity of time the utterers of these inflammatory falsehoods are now gasping for breath.

If it were true that the stock of gold had long been growing smaller, the logical and primary result would have been a prominent reduction of the wages of labor. But wages, according to our highest authority, Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, instead of declining, have here advanced, mathematically, 58 per cent, and in purchasing power 72 per cent. Labor-saving machines in manufactures and in farming industries have largely contributed to the cheapening of both clothing and food, and thus it would seem to have been possible to obtain cheaper labor; nevertheless, the wages of labor have greatly advanced. The cheapest-paid labor of the world is where a silver currency only prevails. Some persons are supposed to hate gold because it offers laborers everywhere better wages than silver; and others hate gold, not because it does any wrong to debtors, but because it maintains justice to creditors.

Truth scorns the support of even the whitest lie; and surely we can dismiss the allegation that silver has not depreciated, which appears as the blackest lie and as the chief corner-stone upon which it was proposed to support a Half-Price Silver Coinage party.

Many of the silver-mine-owners will themselves admit that they are unselfish and altruistic, that they are digging for others only, and trying to emancipate the world from what they denounce as "the demonetization of silver,"—the great crime of '73,—but which will be recorded in history as the multitudinous retreat of numerous nations from the fluctuating and descending standard of silver money. These wholly self-esteemed Silver philanthropists might, perhaps, with no more shamefacedness, and with less homespun falsehood, denounce the great crime of the seventeenth century, when fingers were deposed by millionaires from their early and legitimate dinner-table functions and were largely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

superseded by two-tined forks, then wholly unknown to Pilgrims or Puritans. They will argue that fingers have always been available, and in standard use, even from before the time when Abraham and Isaac helped themselves to daily food from one common and central dish; and that simple justice requires that human fingers, thus depreciated, be restored to standard and permanent employment, as it cannot be denied that forks, three-tined and four-tined, have been growing dearer and dearer to the plain people for the past century.

The reckless, unlimited coinage of silver, as proposed by the Populist leaders of the Democratic party, amounts to this: That the United States alone, all other nations having declined to coöperate, shall provide mints, with machinery and skilled workmen, for the coinage of all the silver bullion, foreign or domestic, which may be presented, and shall not only coin the same free of seigniorage or charge, but shall buy and pay for it with its notes—United States silver certificates—at more than twice the value of the silver bullion received, and at four or five times the actual cost to such millionaire mine-owners as Mackay, Clark, Sharon, Hearst, Moffat, and many others who may prefer to "blush unseen."

The scheme is not limited as to time, nor by a fixed amount; but the whole enormous surplus silver of the world is to be continuously unloaded upon the unpitied back of the United States, and for the exclusive profit of silver-mine-owners, and to the injury of everybody else.

Worst of all is the resultant unlimited multiplication of the silver certificates, of which over four hundred millions have been already issued. These are to go forth as the chief money in circulation of the great American Republic, which has on their face only promised to redeem them with silver coins known to be worth less than half their face value, and are likely to become of much lower value by the incomputable daily additions to their present redundance.

Mexico charges 5 per cent seigniorage for the coinage of silver; taking that amount as toll. The owners receive the remainder, which is principally disposed of by exportation. Our large home product, as well as the incomputable surplus of silver bullion which our terms would attract from abroad, we should be compelled to coin and hoard forever, or else submit to the shame of selling our standard coins for export at less than half the sum at which our own people have been compelled to receive them as legal tender. We ought to be thankful that the free-coinage delusion appears to be tottering toward a last and final collapse.

Some of the Fusion Populist leaders are impatient to change the issue. Ex-Governor Boies, who, in tempestuous hatred of gold and ro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mantic love of financial heresies, has been second only to the orator of the Platte, now scornfully repudiates the stale parity of silver and wheat of 1896, and astounds an Iowa convention of his party by proclaiming that they must abandon the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, or they will be ingloriously defeated. We should remember that Ex-Governor Boies does not sail with his teeth against the wind. No doubt he has learned that even in Japan the coinage of silver by the "Oriental Yankees" is now tolerated only at the ratio of 32 to 1, and that silver is expected by Japanese statesmen to continue to fall in value. Ex-Governor Boies may have believed that to deny any depreciation in the value of silver, or to propose its further coinage in the United States at half of the ratio now held to be honest and expedient in Japan, was too prodigal of trickery; and, therefore, he refused to prevaricate any longer on the ratio of 16 to 1.

Ex-Senator Peffer, of Kansas, the wisest and best of Populists,—when not too sorely tempted,—is reported to have said at Kansas City, in cathedral tones and with responsive gestures, that "William J. Bryan of Nebraska is in the storm-centre of a great disturbance; but the storm is going to move, and, unless Mr. Bryan broadens out, it will leave him high and dry." Lord Bacon is a high authority for the axiom, "that if a man be on a high place without rails or good hold, he is ready to fall." Mr. Peffer would have been next to Bacon, if he had told Mr. Bryan he would be "high and dry because he was without rails or good hold." The Ex-Senator, however, sternly continued to slap his victim as follows: "The Silver Question is not the only issue which confronts the American people. It is not even the most important one."

It was cruel to subject the great man of '96 to such trenchant and pitiless disparagement. The declaration that Mr. Bryan "must broaden out," though made by one who himself possibly wears a hat no larger, is the more stinging because made by a friend, and so well grounded that the "middle-of-the-road" men do not deny it. Even the foremost Democrats, unaccustomed to political gastritis, now require sedatives. It must be admitted, I fear, that the author of the charge may have been a little sore from recent lack of appreciation in Kansas; although a just and profound conclusion was reached about the narrow, unimportant, and noisy oratory of Mr. Bryan, which was rather too much like that described by Dean Swift, when he wrote, that "it is with narrow soul'd people, as with narrow-necked bottles: the less they have in them, the more noise they make in pouring out."

Evidently that was precisely what our Kansas critic wanted to say;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, let me repeat, he is the wisest and gentlest of Populists. But how could he ever expect Mr. Bryan himself, or even the Democratic chairman of a great national committee, to admit that the ideas in Mr. Bryan's head needed to be "broadened out," or, alas! that he had less gumption than has ever found a home even in the head of the Ex-Senator from Kansas? Yet the charge ought not to be hastily disputed, although the candidate of 1896 may very likely resent it, and challenge a comparison of heads; may even hold it more defamatory than to be once more flattened out in a Presidential election. It was, however, the utterance of a friend no longer blind to serious, nor to some jocose, defects.

A Populist *régime*, if it had the power, would claim the fatherhood of all future political, financial, and popular reforms, including: fiat money, or an easy way to pay debts; the national ownership of railroads, with free passes for all who vote as the Populists do; a national law limiting the hours of labor, in order to give time for saloon recreation and more holidays; and unstinted judicial reform, such as might shield men from being punished because they do not obey all laws and every word precisely as some judge may interpret them.

The world's output of silver in 1896 was greater than that of both gold and silver in 1874. Even the output of silver in the United States alone was greater than that of the whole world in 1874. The sources of supply appear inexhaustible; while the demand for coinage purposes has grown slender and problematical.

For the United States alone to open its mints to the free coinage of silver, with the idea of restoring its value to what it was in former years, or prior to the abandonment of its coinage by Germany, Russia, Austria-Hungary, the Latin Union, the Scandinavian Union, Japan, India, and Chile, would prove a "big-headed" example of national conceit.

The United States has now become a great, if not the greatest, industrial nation of the world. No other country annually produces a larger amount of coal, iron, copper, zinc, gold, silver, wheat, corn, potatoes, marble, granite, kerosene oil, cotton, and general manufactures. There seems to be no end to the increase of these vast industries, for which a large market is found abroad. Last year the excess of our exports of merchandise was $615,000,000; and the excess of our imports of gold was $105,000,000. All this was due and has been, or must be, paid in gold or its equivalent. This indebtedness can be wiped out only by such money as we have to pay our debts with abroad.

If our financial system had been brought under the dominion and guidance of the Silver Populists, this large sum of $720,000,000 might

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all have been paid to us on the silver standard, and we should have received less than half the amount. We should have been in the silver condition of Mexico, where the United States gold dollar can be exchanged for more than two silver Mexican dollars; which latter can be used at face value in payment for any kind of Mexican merchandise. The wages of Mexicans in silver-mines, if paid with gold of the United States, would be only from 12 to 25 cents per day. On this basis the output of silver yields an immense profit. Owners of silver can have their silver coined in Mexico; but neither the price of silver, nor that of labor, shows any increase in consequence.

The field of enterprise in the United States is too great, its number of working-men too vast, and its honor too precious, to be content with any standard of money less than that of the best of Christian nations.

JUSTIN S. MORRILL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ABOUT PLAY-ACTING.

I.

I HAVE a project to suggest. But first I will write a chapter of introduction.

I have just been witnessing a remarkable play, here at the Burg Theatre in Vienna. I do not know of any play that much resembles it. In fact, it is such a departure from the common laws of the drama, that the name "play" doesn't seem to fit it quite snugly. However, whatever else it may be, it is in any case a great and stately metaphysical poem, and deeply fascinating. "Deeply fascinating" is the right term: for the audience sat four hours and five minutes without thrice breaking into applause, except at the close of each act; sat rapt and silent—fascinated. This piece is "The Master of Palmyra." It is twenty years old; yet I doubt if you have ever heard of it. It is by Wilbrandt, and is his masterpiece and the work which is to make his name permanent in German literature. It has never been played anywhere except in Berlin and in the great Burg Theatre in Vienna. Yet whenever it is put on the stage it packs the house, and the free list is suspended. I know people who have seen it ten times; they know the most of it by heart; they do not tire of it; and they say they shall still be quite willing to go and sit under its spell whenever they get the opportunity.

There is a dash of metempsychosis in it—and it is the strength of the piece. The play gave me the sense of the passage of a dimly connected procession of dream-pictures. The scene of it is Palmyra in Roman times. It covers a wide stretch of time,—I don't know how many years,—and in the course of it the chief actress is reincarnated several times: four times she is a more or less young woman; and once she is a lad. In the first act she is *Zoe*,—a Christian girl who has wandered across the desert from Damascus to try to Christianize the Zeus-worshipping pagans of Palmyra. In this character she is wholly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spiritual, a religious enthusiast, a devotee who covets martyrdom—and gets it.

After many years she appears in the second act as *Phœbe*, a graceful and beautiful young light-o'-love from Rome, whose soul is all for the shows and luxuries and delights of this life—a dainty and capricious featherhead, a creature of shower and sunshine, a spoiled child, but a charming one. In the third act, after an interval of many years, she reappears as *Persida*, mother of a daughter in the fresh bloom of youth. She is now a sort of combination of her two earlier selves: in religious loyalty and subjection she is *Zoe;* in triviality of character and shallowness of judgment—together with a touch of vanity in dress—she is *Phœbe*.

After a lapse of years she appears in the fourth act as *Nymphas*, a beautiful boy, in whose character the previous incarnations are engagingly mixed.

And after another stretch of years all these heredities are joined in the *Zenobia* of the fifth act—a person of gravity, dignity, sweetness, with a heart filled with compassion for all who suffer, and a hand prompt to put into practical form the heart's benignant impulses.

You will easily concede that the actress who proposes to discriminate nicely these five characters, and play them to the satisfaction of a cultivated and exacting audience, has her work cut out for her. Mme. Hohenfels has made these parts her peculiar property; and she is well able to meet all the requirements. You perceive, now, where the chief part of the absorbing fascination of this piece lies: it is in watching this extraordinary artist melt these five characters into each other—grow, shade by shade, out of one and into another through a stretch of four hours and five minutes.

There are a number of curious and interesting features in this piece. For instance, its hero, *Appelles*, young, handsome, vigorous, in the first act, remains so all through the long flight of years covered by the five acts. Other men, young in the first act, are touched with gray in the second, are old and racked with infirmities in the third: in the fourth, all but one are gone to their long home; and he is a blind and helpless hulk of ninety or a hundred years. It indicates that the stretch of time covered by the piece is seventy years or more. The scenery undergoes decay, too,—the decay of age, assisted and perfected by a conflagration. The fine new temples and palaces of the second act are by and by a wreck of crumbled walls and prostrate columns, mouldy, grass-grown, and desolate; but their former selves are still recognizable in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their ruins. The aging men and the aging scenery together convey a profound illusion of that long lapse of time: they make you live it yourself! You leave the theatre with the weight of a century upon you.

Another strong effect: Death, in person, walks about the stage in every act. So far as I could make out, he was supposably not visible to any excepting two persons—the one he came for and *Appelles*. He used various costumes: but there was always more black about them than any other tint; and so they were always sombre. Also they were always deeply impressive and, indeed, awe-inspiring. The face was not subjected to changes, but remained the same, first and last—a ghastly white. To me he was always welcome, he seemed so real—the actual Death, not a play-acting artificiality. He was of a solemn and stately carriage; and he had a deep voice, and used it with a noble dignity. Wherever there was a turmoil of merry-making or fighting or feasting or chaffing or quarrelling, or a gilded pageant, or other manifestation of our trivial and fleeting life, into it drifted that black figure with the corpse-face, and looked its fateful look and passed on; leaving its victim shuddering and smitten. And always its coming made the fussy human pack seem infinitely pitiful and shabby and hardly worth the attention of either saving or damning.

In the beginning of the first act the young girl *Zoe* appears by some great rocks in the desert, and sits down, exhausted, to rest. Presently arrive a pauper couple, stricken with age and infirmities; and they begin to mumble and pray to the Spirit of Life, who is said to inhabit that spot. The Spirit of Life appears; also Death—uninvited. They are (supposably) invisible. Death, tall, black-robed, corpse-faced, stands motionless and waits. The aged couple pray to the Spirit of Life for a means to prop up their existence and continue it. Their prayer fails. The Spirit of Life prophesies *Zoe's* martyrdom: it will take place before night. Soon *Appelles* arrives, young and vigorous and full of enthusiasm; he has led a host against the Persians and won the battle; he is the pet of fortune, rich, honored, beloved, "Master of Palmyra." He has heard that whoever stretches himself out on one of those rocks there, and asks for a deathless life, can have his wish. He laughs at the tradition, but wants to make the trial anyway. The invisible Spirit of Life warns him: "Life without end can be regret without end." But he persists: let him keep his youth, his strength, and his mental faculties unimpaired, and he will take all the risks. He has his desire.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From this time forth, act after act, the troubles and sorrows and misfortunes and humiliations of life beat upon him without pity or respite; but he will not give up, he will not confess his mistake. Whenever he meets Death he still furiously defies him—but Death patiently waits. He, the healer of sorrows, is man's best friend: the recognition of this will come. As the years drag on, and on, and on, the friends of the *Master's* youth grow old; and one by one they totter to the grave: he goes on with his proud fight, and will not yield. At length he is wholly alone in the world; all his friends are dead; last of all, his darling of darlings, his son, the lad *Nymphas*, who dies in his arms. His pride is broken now; and he would welcome Death, if Death would come, if Death would hear his prayers and give him peace. The closing act is fine and pathetic. *Appelles* meets *Zenobia*, the helper of all that suffer, and tells her his story, which moves her pity. By common report she is endowed with more than earthly powers; and, since he cannot have the boon of death, he appeals to her to drown his memory in forgetfulness of his griefs—forgetfulness, "which is death's equivalent." She says (roughly translated), in an exaltation of compassion:

> "Come to me!
> Kneel: and may the power be granted me
> To cool the fires of this poor, tortured brain,
> And bring it peace and healing."

He kneels. From her hand, which she lays upon his head, a mysterious influence steals through him; and he sinks into a dreamy tranquillity.

> "O if I could but so drift
> Through this soft twilight into the night of peace,
> Never to wake again!
> (*Raising his hand, as if in benediction.*)
> O mother earth, farewell!
> Gracious thou wert to me. Farewell!
> Appelles goes to rest."

Death appears behind him and encloses the uplifted hand in his. *Appelles* shudders, wearily and slowly turns, and recognizes his lifelong adversary. He smiles and puts all his gratitude into one simple and touching sentence, "Ich danke dir," and dies.

Nothing, I think, could be more moving, more beautiful, than this close. This piece is just one long, soulful, sardonic laugh at human

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

life. Its title might properly be "Is Life a Failure?" and leave the five acts to play with the answer. I am not at all sure that the author meant to laugh at life. I only notice that he has done it. Without putting into words any ungracious or discourteous things about life, the episodes in the piece seem to be saying all the time—inarticulately: "Note what a silly, poor thing human life is; how childish its ambitions, how ridiculous its pomps, how trivial its dignities, how cheap its heroisms, how capricious its course, how brief its flight, how stingy in hapinesses, how opulent in miseries, how few its prides, how multitudinous its humiliations, how comic its tragedies, how tragic its comedies, how wearisome and monotonous its repetition of its stupid history through the ages, with never the introduction of a new detail, how hard it has tried, from the Creation down, to play itself upon its possessor as a boon, and has never proved its case in a single instance!"

Take note of some of the details of the piece. Each of the five acts contains an independent tragedy of its own. In each act somebody's edifice of hope, or of ambition, or of happiness, goes down in ruins. Even *Appelles'* perennial youth is only a long tragedy, and his life a failure. There are two martyrdoms in the piece; and they are curiously and sarcastically contrasted. In the first act the pagans persecute *Zoe*, the Christian girl, and a pagan mob slaughters her. In the fourth act those same pagans—now very old and zealous—are become Christians, and they persecute the pagans: a mob of them slaughter the pagan youth, *Nymphas*, who is standing up for the old gods of his fathers. No remark is made about this picturesque failure of civilization; but there it stands, as an unworded suggestion that civilization, even when Christianized, was not able wholly to subdue the natural man in that old day—just as in our day the spectacle of a shipwrecked French crew, clubbing women and children who tried to climb into the lifeboats, suggests that civilization has not succeeded in entirely obliterating the natural man even yet. Common sailors! A year ago, in Paris, at a fire, the aristocracy of the same nation clubbed girls and women out of the way to save themselves. Civilization tested at top and bottom both, you see. And in still another panic of fright we have this same "tough" civilization saving its honor by condemning an innocent man to multiform death, and hugging and whitewashing the guilty one.

In the second act a grand Roman official is not above trying to blast *Appelles'* reputation by falsely charging him with misappropriating public moneys. *Appelles*, who is too proud to endure even the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suspicion of irregularity, strips himself to naked poverty to square the unfair account; and *his* troubles begin: the blight which is to continue and spread strikes his life; for the frivolous, pretty creature whom he has brought from Rome has no taste for poverty, and agrees to elope with a more competent candidate. Her presence in the house has previously brought down the pride and broken the heart of *Appelles'* poor old mother; and *her* life is a failure. Death comes for her, but is willing to trade her for the Roman girl; so the bargain is struck with *Appelles*, and the mother is spared for the present.

No one's life escapes the blight. *Timoleus*, the gay satirist of the first two acts, who scoffed at the pious hypocrisies and money-grubbing ways of the great Roman lords, is grown old and fat and blear-eyed and racked with disease in the third, has lost his stately purities, and watered the acid of his wit. *His* life has suffered defeat. Unthinkingly he swears by *Zeus*—from ancient habit—and then quakes with fright; for a fellow-communicant is passing by. Reproached by a pagan friend of his youth for his apostasy, he confesses that principle, when unsupported by an assenting stomach, has to climb down. One must have bread; and "the bread is Christian now." Then the poor, old wreck, once so proud of his iron rectitude, hobbles away, coughing and barking.

In that same act *Appelles* gives his sweet young Christian daughter and her fine young pagan lover his consent and blessing, and makes them utterly happy—for five minutes. Then the priest and the mob come, to tear them apart and put the girl in a nunnery; for marriage between the sects is forbidden. *Appelles'* wife could dissolve the rule; and she wants to do it: but under priestly pressure she wavers; then, fearing that in providing happiness for her child she would be committing a sin dangerous to herself, she goes over to the opposition, and throws the casting vote for the nunnery. The blight has fallen upon the young couple, and *their* life is a failure.

In the fourth act, *Longinus*, who made such a prosperous and enviable start in the first act, is left alone in the desert, sick, blind, helpless, incredibly old, to die: not a friend left in the world—another ruined life. And in that act, also, *Appelles'* worshipped boy, *Nymphas*, done to death by the mob, breathes out his last sigh in his father's arms—one more failure. In the fifth act, *Appelles* himself dies, and is glad to do it; he who so ignorantly rejoiced, only four acts before, over the splendid present of an earthly immortality—the very worst failure of the lot!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

Now I approach my project. Here is the theatre-list for Saturday, May 7, 1898,—cut from the advertising columns of a New York paper:

PROCTOR'S CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCE.
23D ST. REFINED VAUDEVILLE.
Vaudeville debut of
CHARLES A. GARDNER & CO.;
Arthur and Jennie Dunn, Paulinetti and Piquo, Hughey Dougherty, Nichols Sisters, George Evans, others.
SENSATIONAL EDISON WAR-GRAPH.
BALCONIES, 25c. ORCHESTRA, 50c.

PASTOR'S CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCES.
12:30 to 11 P. M. Seats 20 and 30 Cents.
EDISON'S WONDERFUL WAR-SCOPE.
CANFIELD & CARLETON, ELLINORE SISTERS, JOHNNY CARROLL, CURTIS & GORDON.

14TH ST. THEATRE, nr. 6th av. Good seats, 50c.
THOS. E. SHEA in the great naval play,
THE MAN-O'-WAR'S MAN.
SILVER SOUVENIRS at Wed. & Sat. Matinees.

ELECTRICAL SHOW.
2 to 11 P. M. Admission, 50c. Children, 25c.
MADISON SQUARE GARDEN.

HURTIG & SEAMON'S **HARLEM** MUSIC HALL. Orch. and Bal.
Res. 25c. and 50c.
Rogers Bros., Maude Raymond, Joe Welch, Raymond & Kurkamp, Gardner & Gilmore; others.

LYCEUM. 4th Ave. & 23d St. Begins 8:30.
Daniel Frohman, Manager.
Kelcey-Shannon Co. in Clyde Fitch's
THE MOTH AND THE FLAME.

STAR. THE WHITE SQUADRON. Gal. 15c.
Introducing Robt. Hilliard & Laura Biggar. Bal. 25c.
Next Week—"The Mikado." Orch. 50c.

5TH AVE. THEATRE. Broadway and 28th St.
MRS. FISKE Evs. at 8:15. Sat. Mat. at 2.
in LOVE FINDS THE WAY
and A BIT OF OLD CHELSEA.

KEITH'S CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCE,
25c., 50c., Noon to 11 P. M.
BIOGRAPH, CHARLES DICKSON & CO., 4 COHANS, JOHNSTONE BENNETT, GEORGE W. LESLIE, SMITH AND CAMPBELL, GARDNER AND ELY, WEBB AND HASSAN, HALL AND STALEY, BLOCKSOM AND BURNS AND OTHERS.

HARLEM OPERA HOUSE.
Eve. 8:15. Mat. Sat. 2.
HENRY MILLER—THE MASTER.
Next Week—THE HIGHWAYMAN.

PLEASURE PALACE, CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCE. 58TH ST. and 3D AVE.
LEW DOCKSTADER.
Milton and Dollie Nobles, Ivan Greboff, Cushman and Holcombe, C. W. Littlefield; others.
EDISON WAR-GRAPH (NEW VIEWS).
Come any time, 1:30 to 11 P. M.
15c., 25c. AFTS. 25c., 50c. EVGS.

ACADEMY OF MUSIC. 14th St. & Irving Pl.
A STUPENDOUS SUCCESS.
BATTLES OF OUR NATION.
Mats. Wed. & Sat., 2. Eve. 8:15.

SAM T. JACK'S THEATRE,
BROADWAY & 29TH ST.
2 BIG SHOWS EVERY DAY, 2 and 8.
Jennie Yeamans & French Importations.

WEBER & FIELDS' MUSIC HALL. **MAT. TO-DAY.**
POUSSE CAFE AND THE **CON-CURERS.**
MISS BESSIE CLAYTON, the Queen of Dancers.

BIJOU Matinee To-day at 2.
To-night at 8:15.
Last Two Performances of
MY FRIEND FROM INDIA.
NEXT WEEK—THE TARRYTOWN WIDOW.

AMERICAN 8th ave. and 42d st. Tel. 3147-38.
EVE. 8:15. MAT. WED. & SAT. 2.
Castle Square Opera Company.
6TH MONTH | 80 Artists Present **THE BEGGAR STUDENT.**
ENTIRE HOUSE, 25, 50, 75. Mat. To day, 25 & 50.
NEXT WEEK—FAUST (IN ENGLISH).

EMPIRE THEATRE. B'way and 40th st.
WM. H. **CRANE** | HIS HONOR **THE MAYOR.**
Evenings at 8:30. Mats. To-day and Wed. at 2:15.

OLYMPIA MUSIC HALL. Mat. To-day.
ADGIE, Marguerite Sylva, & 20 others.
NEXT WEEK. An Original Patriotic Extravaganza. **"WAR BUBBLES."**

KNICKERBOCKER. B'WAY & 38TH.
EVENINGS AT 8:15. MAT. TO-DAY AT 2:15.
SOUSA'S NEW OPERA. **THE BRIDE-ELECT**

KOSTER & BIAL'S ADM. 50C. MAT. TO-DAY.
ADELE RITCHIE in "AU BAIN."
Truly Shattuck, Gerome Edwardy, and others.

WALLACK'S Evgs. 8:15. Mat. To-day, 2.
LAST WEEK IN **THE BOSTONIANS THE SERENADE.**

Daly's Evenings, 8:15. Matinee To-day, 2.
THE CIRCUS GIRL.
Virginia Earl, James Powers, &c.
"A trump card; very bright."—Herald.
"Evening of unalloyed enjoyment."—Trib.

Now I arrive at my project, and make my suggestion. From the look of this lightsome feast, I conclude that what you need is a tonic.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Send for "The Master of Palmyra." You are trying to make yourself believe that life is a comedy, that its sole business is fun, that there is nothing serious in it. You are ignoring the skeleton in your closet. Send for the "Master of Palmyra." You are neglecting a valuable side of your life; presently it will be atrophied. You are eating too much mental sugar; you will bring on Bright's disease of the intellect. You need a tonic; you need it very much. Send for the "Master of Palmyra." You will not need to translate it: its story is as plain as a procession of pictures.

I have made my suggestion. Now I wish to put an annex to it. And that is this: It is right and wholesome to have those light comedies and entertaining shows; and I shouldn't wish to see them diminished. But none of us is *always* in the comedy spirit; we have our graver moods; they come to us all; the lightest of us cannot escape them. These moods have their appetites,—healthy and legitimate appetites,—and there ought to be some way of satisfying them. It seems to me that New York ought to have one theatre devoted to tragedy. With her three millions of population, and seventy outside millions to draw upon, she can afford it, she can support it. America devotes more time, labor, money, and attention to distributing literary and musical culture among the general public than does any other nation, perhaps; yet here you find her neglecting what is possibly the most effective of all the breeders and nurses and disseminators of high literary taste and lofty emotion—the tragic stage. To leave that powerful agency out is to haul the culture-wagon with a crippled team. Nowadays, when a mood comes which only Shakespeare can set to music, what must we do? Read Shakespeare ourselves! Isn't it pitiful? It is playing an organ solo on a jew's-harp. *We* can't read. None but the Booths can do it.

Thirty years ago Edwin Booth played "Hamlet" a hundred nights in New York. With three times the population, how often is "Hamlet" played now in a year? If Booth were back now in his prime, how often could he play it in New York? Some will say twenty-five nights. I will say three hundred, and say it with confidence. The tragedians are dead; but I think that the taste and intelligence which made their market are not.

What *has* come over us English-speaking people? During the first half of this century tragedies and great tragedians were as common with us as farce and comedy; and it was the same in England. Now we have not a tragedian, I believe; and London, with her fifty shows and theatres,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has but three, I think. It is an astonishing thing, when you come to consider it. Vienna remains upon the ancient basis: there has been no change. She sticks to the former proportions: a number of rollicking comedies, admirably played, every night; and also every night at the Burg Theatre—that wonder of the world for grace and beauty and richness and splendor and costliness—a majestic drama of depth and seriousness, or a standard old tragedy. It is only within the last dozen years that men have learned to do miracles on the stage in the way of grand and enchanting scenic effects; and it is at such a time as this that we have reduced our scenery mainly to different breeds of parlors and varying aspects of furniture and rugs. I think we must have a Burg in New York, and Burg scenery, and a great company like the Burg company. Then, with a tragedy-tonic once or twice a month, we shall enjoy the comedies all the better. Comedy keeps the heart sweet; but we all know that there is wholesome refreshment for both mind and heart in an occasional climb among the solemn pomps of the intellectual snow-summits built by Shakespeare and those others. Do I seem to be preaching? It is out of my line: I only do it because the rest of the clergy seem to be on vacation. MARK TWAIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CONDUCT OF THE CUBANS IN THE LATE WAR.

It has been my privilege during the past ten years to associate, more or less, with the Cuban people. The command for six years of the Department of the East brought me into contact with them in Key West, in Tampa, and elsewhere on the Southern coast; and I was enabled to pay one visit of several days to Havana. During the present year I have very naturally had unusual opportunities for meeting and conversing with them at length. I have met officers who had served under Gomez and Garcia, and others who had been detached to act with our army and navy operating on the coast of Cuba. More recently I have been brought into contact with Cuban physicians of scientific attainment and with families of importance; and I think I have seen enough of the lower stratum of the Cuban social fabric to form a correct judgment of its characteristics as a people.

First. It can be asserted, as a truth not likely to be contradicted, that the Cubans, within and without the country,—that is, the vast majority of them,—are determined to secure for Cuba a government independent of Spain.

Second. The Cubans would like to have a government in which the people would have a voice. If it be a republic, and the republican form is preferred, they do not wish it to be established under the influence of intense partisanship. They naturally fear divisions, feuds, and the revival of old animosities; so that

Third. The wisest among them see no safety in beginning a new government except under the protection of the United States. The President's promise to secure to Cuba "a stable government" satisfies all their hearts, and brightens all their hopes of the future.

Fourth. Any indication of a purpose on the part of the United States to ignore the counsel of their best men, and seemingly to put them at a distance, is a source of deep humiliation and sorrow to the thinking Cubans. The Spaniards have told them again and again that our people were not *bona fide* friends; that as soon as we should have them in our hands we should humiliate them, take away their possessions, and trample upon their rights.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fifth. Before the Battle of Santiago a thorough plan was formulated, which depended, for successful execution, on the coöperation of the Cuban insurgents—said to be organized and in the field, with Gomez in supreme command—and on the coöperation of this force, or a detachment of it, with our navy and army on their arrival in the vicinity of Santiago. Gen. Garcia, with the Cuban contingent, came to the coast as agreed upon. Our navy made a lodgment near the entrance to the harbor of Guantanamo. Capt. McCalla held the landing by occupying an important height with his marines. His garrison was small; and it wearied his men exceedingly to hold the position night and day without reinforcement. A reinforcement, however, came in time, sent by Garcia from his Cuban contingent. I saw in the hands of Col. Laborde, a wounded Cuban officer, an expression of thanks given by Capt. McCalla in writing to Laborde for the part that he and his Cubans had borne in driving back Spanish forces which bothered his flanks and undertook to recover the height. In conversing with several naval officers, also, I found that they were pleased with the Cubans' coöperation at a later period.

It appears that Gen. Shafter first landed at a place called Acerraderos, already in possession of the Cubans. In that neighborhood he met both Garcia and Castillo. There, between them, the whole topography of the country was fully considered; and it was agreed that, as nearly as possible simultaneously with the attempt at landing our troops, five hundred Cubans should be put ashore near Sigua, some twelve miles east of D'aikiri, the point selected for the army's landing, and that five hundred more, coming from another direction, should join them, so that a command of one thousand men would sweep along westward back of the hills, and clear the landing of D'aikiri. This was done by the Cuban commander; the "Vixen," under Capt. Sharp, having carried the first five hundred to their place of debarkation. It appears that the Cubans were so promptly on hand that the Spaniards fled from D'aikiri before the shelling by our fleet had ceased; one Cuban being killed and two wounded by our own shells, owing to the force ashore having been mistaken for Spaniards.

The advance from D'aikiri toward Santiago was assisted by a thorough coöperation with the Cubans as flankers and skirmishers as far as La Quasimas; causing the evacuation by the Spaniards of Siboney. After that there was such eagerness, and perhaps rivalry, between different regiments to press ahead that the Cubans were not so much in demand; but still Gen. Lawton, in a letter to Castillo, gives him high

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

praise for his help, his gallantry, and the readiness of his men to do what was required of them.

There is some controversy with regard to the part the Cuban patriots bore on the extreme right of Shafter's line. At the time four thousand Spaniards were allowed to come into the beleaguered city. Only three hundred Cubans defended the Cobre road; and these were engaged by the Spaniards, four thousand strong, and driven out, though not without considerable loss to the Spaniards. It appears to me that the Cuban contingent performed an important part in the advance on Santiago, and did their work reasonably well. They did not bring from Gomez as many men as they had promised, and their manner of fighting, which they had been practising for several years, did not accord with the American idea; yet all due credit must be given by us to a coöperation without which the taking of Santiago would have been much more difficult. Had Gen. Shafter really designed, cost what it might, to cut off and destroy Pando's four thousand, he would not have intrusted so important a work to the Cuban forces, reduced as they were by several detachments to other points. Undoubtedly Garcia's force of undisciplined men was far weaker than a corresponding number from any other brigade or division of Shafter's army would have been. He probably did not care much for that Spanish reinforcement; for it would only increase the number of the garrison to be fed and to be captured. Pando's commander simply put his four thousand men into Shafter's pocket. Indeed, I learn from one who was present that Gen. Shafter gave Garcia to understand that he himself would be pleased to have Pando's commander slip into his trap.

There are some stories about the Cuban soldiers picking up blankets, and others of their firing upon Spaniards helpless in the water, and the like; yet no friend of the Cubans will believe that many, even of the common Cuban soldiers, did these things. They had for years been fighting an enemy that had hardly ever spared a prisoner; yet the Cuban commanders wonderfully refrained from retaliation and revenge when Spanish prisoners fell into their hands. Whatever may be said to show his degradation, the Cuban is not a savage, nor is he a thief. It is, indeed, remarkable how he loves to dispense hospitality, or to do one a service, when he can—always without reward.

The common Cuban has his vices and immoralities; and they need eradication. He has his feuds, his hatreds, his revenges, like the inhabitants of Sicily; and there are corruptions, due to a perpetual state of war and to malignant oppression. All these will be swept away by the introduction of a thorough educational system, and by a proper moral

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

training under wholesome laws properly administered. I believe that after the Spaniards shall have gone, and a good government shall have been established,—a government which shall encourage and foster, but not undertake to control, the offices of religion,—Cuba will be a fruitful field, rich in the products of virtue and of loyalty to right; for the basis is a people of kindly natures and warm hearts.

With these convictions, I am pained to see, on the part of some of our public journals and many private citizens, a disposition to alienate the Cuban patriots. We did not expect to find angels in the present Cuban people. Their old men, their women and children, *reconcentrados*, and non-combatants have been so badly treated, so degraded, that those who have not already perished furnish a pitiable sight to American eyes. It will take wholesome government, encouraged industry, and ample time to bring this generation out of the stupor of their prolonged woe. We need not despise any poor soul capable of salvation. Again, then, I call upon all our friends who have made sacrifices in this war to remember that the Cuban patriots have thus far acted loyally, if not so energetically as we could have wished, in coöperating with our commanders; and that, in spite of all assertions to the contrary, the Cuban people, as a whole, are worthy of our protection and our help.

Sixth. The prejudice against the Cubans on the part of our forces that have been operating in Cuba appears to arise mainly from a feeling that these patriots have not properly appreciated the sacrifices of life and health that have been made to give them a free country. Doubtless there is some truth in this view, as there was in the dislike of black men in 1863 in our own country because so many of them did not seem to understand, or be grateful for, what had been done for them. But it should be remembered that the common Cubans are not wise enough, nor well enough informed, to understand precisely our attitude toward them. To them it seems as if we struck blows in their behalf, and almost immediately afterward forbade them to enjoy either the freedom promised or the coveted fruits of the common victory.

We answer that we could not trust them to manage the affairs of Santiago, for fear that they would loot the city and commit outrages upon those who had been hitherto their foes; for there were many such in Santiago. As I understand it, Garcia neither intended nor desired to hold the place given to Gen. Wood; but he did want his officers and himself to have some recognition in the celebration of a victory to which they had certainly contributed in some small degree. Another natural desire on his part was, that Spaniards and Spanish sympathizers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should not be continued in places of responsibility and trust in Santiago. He felt that the mailed glove, and not the friendly hand, was, for some reason, extended to him and his. Surely it was a difficult task to preserve a comparatively hostile government in Santiago in full vogue until Gen. Wood should gradually substitute an American replacement, —difficult indeed to do it and at the same time to make the patriots feel that our Government was their friend. Gen. Miles's kind note, asking further coöperation from Garcia in his Porto Rico expedition, came just at the right time to appease the wounded chieftain. Additional efforts in the same direction will be indispensable on our part.

Further prejudice has appeared in the careless statements of officers who, in their soreness, have made a wholesale condemnation of the Cuban contingent. They say, "Show us any wounded men!" I answer that there were several in every hospital I visited in Key West, and in others concerning which I have had direct testimony. In addition, there is the large Cuban hospital at Firmega, back in the mountains, where there are four thousand wounded men, besides the sick. The Cubans sought the most healthful locality they could find, and naturally carried their sick and wounded to that place. I do not know how many were killed in action; but they probably numbered about one-fifth of the wounded.

To an unprejudiced mind the loss and suffering thus indicated do not warrant the charge of non-coöperation and want of courage. It is further true that our officers seem to have misunderstood the fact, that the Cubans had been detached in parties of about two hundred from Garcia's main body.

I believe that the simple reason so many of them were not used in the places to which they were sent was, that, on account of the difference in language, the Americans and the Cubans did not make themselves mutually understood.

I understand that Garcia, Castillo, Rabi, and other gallant Cuban leaders earnestly desire that the whole matter of accusation and depreciation of their troops be thoroughly investigated. Surely the friends of the Cubans must deprecate any judgment of their behavior founded upon mere prejudice and camp gossip.

O. O. HOWARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMATEURS IN WAR.

"AND *there*, mark you, is the vartue that no money an' no dhrill can buy—the vartue av the ould soldier that knows his orf'cer's work an' does ut at the salute!" Thus spake *Private Mulvaney*, who knew the difference between the soldier and the man,—a difference so great that it passes the comprehension of the amateur.

In soldiering, perhaps more than in anything else, the value of training, of exact knowledge, of professional details is made apparent. Any man of ordinary common sense can master the manual, the one, two, three of the drill-sergeant; the country boy, taken fresh from the farm, can learn, after he has been handled for a few months by *Mulvaney*, *Ortheris*, and *Learoyd*, to stand with his heels together, his chest thrown out, and his hands touching the seams of his trousers; but "the vartue av the ould soldier" is not to be learned on the parade-ground nor to be picked up in a few lessons. It is the one thing which cannot be bought, which cannot be forced, which cannot be found by chance. It comes slowly, by gradual upbuilding until the level of perfection is reached. And then the man has become a soldier, than whom, in some respects, there is no finer thing on earth.

For years we in this country have gone about soldiering like children playing at a game. We have been the veriest amateurs. Our system has been top-heavy and cumbersome: it has been expensive, unwieldy, and disjointed. Fortunately in one respect, unfortunately in another, it has been put to no severe test. From the close of the Civil War till the recent war with Spain, the regular army of the United States had no more serious work than to fight Indians or occasionally to uphold the dignity of the Federal Government in quelling a riot. Our Indian wars have taught us nothing of the art of modern fighting, or of military tactics as adapted to modern military requirements. Even less has been learned from the conflicts between rioters and regulars.

The greatest lesson of the Civil War, curiously enough, has never been heeded. Because the South was as badly prepared for war as the North; because both sides spent months in drilling and placing their armies in the field; because the military blunders of the North were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only exceeded by those of the South; because when Lee laid down his sword the United States had more than a million men under arms; because for four years a war had been carried on,—a war in some respects more remarkable than any other the world has known,—because of all these things the people of this country have believed that armies can be called into existence by the magic of a President's Proclamation; that a declaration of war transmutes men into soldiers. It has taken the weakest military power of Europe to open our eyes.

A soldier is a product of slow growth. Hammered out of the rough by the drill-sergeant, shaped by his company commander, polished by his major, he, at last, after having passed through the hands of the colonel, becomes the finished article. Even then he is only half a soldier. He can march, he knows what a command means and can carry it out, he can use his rifle and his bayonet; but he has still more, much more, to learn. The soldier must learn to take care of himself on the march and in the field; and, above all, he must learn that most difficult of all things—implicit obedience.

Herein lies the difference between the soldier—and by the soldier I mean the man in the ranks of the regular army—and the volunteer. The former, by obeying—he has been taught from the first to learn that obedience to his superiors is his first as well as last duty—and by constant association with his officers, becomes simply a machine to do what he is told to do. To call a man a machine is no reflection upon his intellect or his manhood. Like a machine, he is perfect in all his parts, ready to respond to the lightest touch of the controlling power. The volunteer, on the other hand, knows not the meaning of the word discipline. He has served no long apprenticeship in the art of learning subordination; he has not been drilled and hammered and pounded until compliance with a command becomes a second nature. Out of his uniform the volunteer frequently commands instead of being commanded. He cannot change the habits of a lifetime with his change of clothes. But perhaps more important even than this, and which makes the volunteer force an extremely frail reed to rely on in case of emergency, is the inability of the volunteer officer to wield that peculiar psychological power without which no man is the master of men. Nor is this surprising. Between the soldier and the officer there is a wide gulf, even in a republic; and no attempt is made to bridge it. It is well that it should be so. The soldier is content to rely on the wisdom of his officer. The man in the ranks stands sentry, or faces a battery, not because he likes to do one better than the other,—and soldiers, like

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the rest of us, think their trade a little bit harder than any other,—but because someone higher in rank has told him to do it, and he has enough confidence in that someone to believe in him. But with the volunteer it is different. His superior officer may be, frequently is, his social inferior. As to his military knowledge, there are often grave doubts. He gives a command; but it inspires no confidence. The men in the ranks unconsciously feel that they are following a blind leader.

The writer has no intention of casting any reflections upon the volunteers. He has lately seen them under fire in Cuba, he has seen them on the march and in the trenches, and he has seen such conspicuous examples of bravery and devotion to duty as to arouse his profound admiration. Whatever just criticisms may be made are directed, not against individuals, but against a system,—a system which takes it for granted that an amateur is the equal of a graduate. And I contend that in soldiering, as in everything else, the master of his art is a far better man than the tyro. Courage, like a taste for olives or a cold plunge in midwinter, is an acquired habit. Pick out at random a hundred men, and a surprisingly small percentage—of Anglo-Saxons—will show the white feather when suddenly confronted with danger. Some will behave better than others, which may be set down to any one of a dozen causes; but few will act like curs. Those who come out best from the ordeal will be the men who have served their novitiate. They have faced death, and pushed it away from them; and they have learned that what they thought was Death is merely one of his minor satellites with power to terrify, but not to destroy.

Many harsh and unwarranted things have been said about volunteers who refused to go into action. We have heard of one regiment becoming so demoralized that it threatened the entire line, and, to avert a panic, had to be unceremoniously sent to the rear. These things do not imply cowardice. They simply show the folly of expecting amateurs to do that which taxes the capacity of experienced professionals. Most men admit that they experienced a feeling of terror the first time they heard the flight of a bullet. There is something terrible in the shrieking, rending scream of a bursting shell, or the high-pitched whistle of a bullet from a modern rifle; and when shells burst, and men and horses fall in a shapeless mass, and the whistle of the bullet is followed by a groan, and where was once a man is only a space in the ranks, men must have nerves of steel and be possessed of the stoicism of an Indian, not to feel that "chilly devil" which Kipling has so well described. But, after the first period of nervous exaltation and hysterical depression has passed away

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—its duration varying with the mental and physical make-up of the individual—shells and bullets appear less dreadful. Between the veteran and the raw recruit there is a psychological difference only. Physically the recruit may be the better man of the two; but he has "nerves." The veteran's nerves have become absorbed in the process of evolution through which he has passed.

In nearly every relation of life the individual counts for a great deal more than the aggregate: nowhere is this so marked as in an army. In the words of Napoleon, "In war *men* are nothing; *a man* is everything." Take a hundred men in a company, and their efficiency and *morale* will depend, in the first instance, upon their first sergeant, who, being generally experienced and knowing barrack-room politics, puts some sensible ideas into their heads. If the captain commanding the company be the right kind of man, the good work goes on; but it is essential that the men have confidence in their commander. He may bully them and he may violate the Articles of War by swearing at them,—which sounds badly, but isn't so very dreadful,—but no man will care, if he possesses courage and knows his business. If he has those two things, his men will follow him not only into the jaws of death, but through and out on the other side. In the scale of progression the good work of a captain may be destroyed by a colonel,—a fussy old woman who will punish a man for a button awry and be blind to pluck. Given a colonel who knows his soldiers and has their confidence, and you have the most perfect piece of machinery the handiwork of man can turn out. There is nothing more superb than a regiment which, like an endless chain, is a series of unbroken links extending from the private in the ranks to the colonel. Such regiments have made history and glorified their country.

To the average man, who knows nothing of military affairs, and whose knowledge of the army is confined to an occasional parade, or the turn-out of a volunteer regiment when it escorts a fire-company to a country fair, the men in the ranks are all that there is to the army. If he should think, he would perhaps admit that soldiers have to be fed and clothed and housed, and occasionally transported here and there. But soldiers have rations, which they get in some mysterious manner; and the Government, which is a nebulous institution, chiefly designed to make trouble for hard-working people and to provide places for lazy ones, furnishes them with clothes. The soldier toils not, neither does he spin: but he has his rations and his uniform; and what more could any well-disposed person want? In our dilettante way, the army has been allowed to take care of itself; while an institution, known as the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Staff Corps," has grown up. Had Congress purposely devised a system which should go to pieces the moment the slightest strain was put upon it, it could not have more cunningly contrived than when it created the various staff departments of the army. Put the best troops in the world in the field, and starve them, and they become of little value; or send them into the tropics in the worst season of the year, clad in uniforms suitable for a climate where snow covers the ground until late in the summer, and you may expect them to fall ready victims to disease. These things happened in the campaign before Santiago. Never was such absolute incompetence displayed; never did men prove so unfitted for the duties imposed upon them.

Going back to the time when the army was encamped in Tampa, one sees there a record so shameful that the mystery of it is, that it should have been permitted to stand unchallenged. The movement of troops and the transportation of their supplies devolve upon the Quartermaster-General, one of the Staff Corps which came so perilously near to wrecking the army. Much has been said of the difficulties with which the Quartermaster's Department had to contend in moving some sixteen thousand men from Tampa to Cuba. "Qui s'excuse s'accuse." The excuses and explanations of our amateur transportation managers have only served to emphasize the fact that the accusations were well founded. Temperate as one may wish to be, it is difficult to restrain oneself in discussing the inexcusable blunders committed by the staff departments; and it is only fair to say that no single department was worse than any other. The apologists of the Quartermaster's Department, with more zeal than discretion, have urged that allowances ought to be made, as it was a task unheard of to send men and supplies across the sea. But was it? It seems to me, speaking with all due humility as a layman, that, given a certain number of men and so many tons of food and other rations, it was a simple calculation to determine the cubic capacity of the vessels necessary for their transportation. Certainly the calculation is worked out every week in the year by the managers of the great ocean transportation lines, who know to a nicety how many passengers and how many tons of freight their vessels will carry, and who have their systems so perfectly organized that the largest ships leave their docks with the precision of express trains. But then, these managers are professionals and not amateurs, which may perhaps explain the difference.

To the Quartermaster was intrusted the responsible duty of furnishing transportation for the army and loading the vessels. It would occur

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to most people to place in the bottom and least accessible parts of the holds those supplies not immediately needed; reserving the upper part for articles which would be required as soon as the troops landed. Yet, when the troops debarked in Cuba, there was witnessed the melancholy spectacle of a commissary officer sitting on a huge pile of soap and candles, while troops at the front were without rations. Now, soap and candles are valuable in a campaign, but hard-tack and coffee are better; unwashed men, with no light to shine upon their glorious deeds, having been known to win battles, but starving men seldom. Why, when men clamored for hard-tack, they were permitted to look upon soap and candles, is easily explained. These articles were placed on top, presumably because they happened to be overlooked until the last moment; and, of course, in unloading the vessel, they had to be taken out before the more valuable food and ammunition could be discharged.

Disheartening and exasperating as it was to witness these things, it must, in fairness to the officers, be said that it was the system which was responsible for the many mistakes they made. *En passant*, it may be well to correct a popular error. It has been generally supposed that with the outbreak of the war the staff departments were flooded with civilians, men who secured their appointments through political influence, and that it was owing to these political, civilian appointees that the Staff Corps was so hopelessly demoralized. It is true, numerous civilians were given staff appointments; but in every case the men at the head of affairs were officers of the regular army, of many years' service. In numerous cases the civilians, being practical men, did better than their amateur superiors. The latter made mistakes because they were without practical experience.

Since the close of the Civil War, the quartermasters of the army have occasionally had to move a regiment from one post to another. When that operation was to be performed, the Quartermaster would send for his clerk and instruct him to make the necessary arrangements; and the clerk would, either by public or private contract, secure the transportation from the railroad company offering the best terms. The practical details were left to the railroad companies, who, being supplied with the number of men and the amount of baggage to be moved, furnished the requisite number of cars, just as they would have done had they been given a contract to move coal or iron or any other freight. Curiously enough, the higher in rank the less able the officer of the Quartermaster's Department is to perform his duties. A lieutenant performing the duties of regimental quartermaster must actually do the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work himself, because he has no one to assist him. If he is very lucky, he sometimes finds an enlisted man who is competent to act as his clerk and who is capable of doing some of the routine work; but the real work rests upon his shoulders. When he becomes a full-fledged quartermaster, and is transferred to the corps, he gets a clerk; and the higher he goes, the more numerous the clerical force at his disposal, until in the fulness of time he reaches the *Ultima Thule* of all military ambition and occupies an office in Washington. When that happens, he has forgotten what little he knew in his younger days.

Two other staff corps—the Medical and the Commissary—have divided with that of the Quartermaster's the dubious honors of the recent war. Here, as in the Quartermaster's Department, the system is chiefly responsible for the almost criminal blunders which forced men either to go hungry or to live on fat bacon and salt pork, than which there can be nothing much worse for men in a climate so devitalizing as Cuba. When supplies were at last brought to the front, tomatoes in two-pound cans were issued. Think of men having to march and go into battle with bulky tomato cans stowed about their persons! Yet the Commissary Department had so little knowledge of the actual requirements of war, that, because tomatoes for commercial use are sold in cans containing two pounds, that size was accepted for the army. It would have been as easy to furnish the tomatoes in half-pound cans as in two-pound ones; and this would have vastly increased the comfort of the soldier. The Subsistence Department, like the Quartermaster's, is decaying from inanition. To provision a few hundred men in garrison, requires no great knowledge or executive capacity. This has been the experience of commissary officers for the past thirty years. They have drawn supplies, they have signed their names to vouchers, they have drawn their salaries, and, if they have lived long enough and escaped the shoals of a court martial, they have gained their promotions. Can one wonder that, when confronted with an emergency, they proved themselves unable to meet it?

The Medical Corps, being part military and part scientific, may perhaps be excused for its numerous *lâches;* scientific men being notoriously lacking in administrative faculty. Still, even the most charitable may with propriety question if a system which permits regiments to go into action without surgeons is not faulty. Under the same system, troops in an enemy's country had bullets dug from their bodies with penknives, because the surgeons neglected to furnish hospitals and had not their instrument-cases at hand. With a battle imminent, no provision was made for the care of the wounded; and when, after the battle, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wounded were brought in, as might have been expected, by tens and hundreds, there were no means for their proper treatment. In any large city, on the day of a parade or other event bringing thousands of people together, the police and the hospital authorities, anticipating casualties, prepare themselves accordingly, and skilfully and quickly take care of the injured. Here, again, the difference between the man trained to his work and the amateur is strikingly apparent.

But the remedy for all these things? The remedy, I venture to suggest, is readily accessible, if we will disregard past traditions and adopt methods more in keeping with modern progress. The necessity of a larger standing army and a higher state of efficiency among the volunteers is conceded. The political events of the last few months have made it incumbent on the United States to increase its military resources. Very much has been said recently of the value of a "General Staff"; and military experts have pointed to the magnificent work of the German General Staff, which owed its creation to the genius of Moltke. While military conditions in Germany are so unlike those which prevail in this country that it is unsafe to take the German army as our guide, yet a General Staff would be of value, as it would mean a reorganization of the staff departments and a change in the present system. It would be the first step, if we are to put the army upon a business basis, and intrust affairs to men of practical experience; but it would not go to the root of the evil. In a country where reliance must be placed upon a volunteer army, it is all-essential that the volunteers be imbued with the discipline and training of the regular army. This can be done at a comparatively small expense, and without in any way disturbing present social and political conditions. For purposes of military administration, the United States is divided into military departments. The Department of the East,[1] which will do as well as any other by way of illustration, comprises the New England States, the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, and the District of Columbia. In these States there is an organized militia force of 75,634 officers and men, of all branches of the service. These 75,000 volunteers, with the assent of the various States, should be incorporated into the divisions of the army corps of the East. Thus, roughly, the six New England States and New York would furnish about 26,000 men, or enough

[1] As it existed up to March 12, 1898. On that date certain of these States were transferred to the new "Department of the Gulf."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to constitute one full division. But no division should be composed exclusively of volunteers: at least one-third of the strength of every brigade should be regulars. Once a year the troops constituting the Department of the East should be mobilized. This would give everybody practical experience, from the raw recruit to the general in command of the Department. If the conditions were made to resemble as nearly as possible a state of actual hostilities, the week or ten days spent in the field would be of inestimable benefit to the two services—regulars and volunteers.

Assuming the point of concentration to be in North Carolina, and that a force of about 75,000 was called into the field (and to the volunteers must be added the regulars, of whom there would probably be not less than 10,000 or 15,000 in the Department of the East), officers of the line, no less than officers of the staff, would in this way learn what can never be acquired on the parade-ground or in an office. The Quartermaster would be given practical experience in the transportation of men, animals, supplies, and *impedimenta* from a dozen points to the place of concentration; and in a very short time quartermasters would find out those things which, in the recent campaign, because of their ignorance, destroyed the efficiency of the army. The men should live in tents. The provisioning of the army would furnish data for the Commissary Department; while the sickness and casualties naturally to be expected would give the medical officers practical experience in the business of war. The value to the line, officers and men, cannot be overestimated. Under the command of regular-army officers, volunteers—men as well as officers—would learn discipline: they would learn the difference between amateur soldiering and professional. In addition, contact with the regulars would teach them how to take care of themselves in the field; and that knowledge is only second in importance to the habit of learning to obey.

The old soldier has many tricks which the untrained man acquires only after much sorrow. Few volunteers know how to cook or to make the most of the food furnished them. The volunteer has been known to throw away his canteen, his blanket, his rations even, because their weight was oppressive. As a result of his ignorance, he has suffered from thirst and cold and hunger, conditions which very quickly lead to the hospital. And, while the volunteer was learning the rudiments of war, his commanding officers would be taking a post-graduate course. Since the close of the Civil War, general officers have never had under their command at one time more than a few thousand men. Of tactics

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on a grand scale they know nothing, because they have not had the pieces with which to play the game. Brigade and division commanders would profit immensely by having to handle large bodies of troops, and by conducting a campaign under conditions approaching reality.

To obtain the use of the volunteers, the National Government would doubtless have to pay all the expenses of the encampment, which would be perfectly proper. The Federal Government now makes an annual appropriation to the militia force. Those States which refused to send their troops to the departmental encampment should lose their share of the appropriation; or perhaps the system under which the appropriation is distributed might be advantageously changed, and a fixed amount be paid to the State for every man present at the encampment, as shown by the muster-rolls.

It will doubtless be urged, that the remedy proposed is unnecessary, inasmuch as summer encampments of the volunteers are held in nearly every State, to which a regular army officer is usually detailed as inspecting officer; a battery of artillery or a few companies of regulars sometimes encamping with the volunteers. These summer encampments are play, not business. The men look forward to them as a "jolly lark"; and they devote more time to entertaining female relatives and friends than they do to military work. Immaculate, white tents are set up in mathematically correct company streets; guitars and sofa-cushions serve to veil the horrors of war; champagne in the officers' and beer in the privates' tents reveal in all their nakedness the hardships of life in the field. There is a little drilling, a sham fight, perhaps, and the inevitable review by the Governor, who, knowing the potency of votes, commends the gallant bearing of his troops in the same way that he admires prize pigs at agricultural fairs, and is very heartily glad when the farce is over. All this, while spectacular, is not war. From a military point of view, the summer encampments teach nothing, and are simply a waste of money. They provide the volunteers with an outing at a trifling cost to themselves; but they serve no purpose in improving the efficiency of the armed force of the State.

If the United States is to profit by its recent costly and disgraceful experience, it must destroy a system which accumulates barnacles; it must give men practical as well as theoretical training; it must remember that, while it is easy enough to create armies on paper, soldiers, unlike poets, are not born, but made, and that the process of manufacture is a slow and difficult one.

A. MAURICE LOW.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR WAR WITH SPAIN, FROM THE POLITICAL POINT OF VIEW.

THE warp of politics is closely interwoven with the woof of every important event in American history. The recent war with Spain has proved no exception to the rule. In a broad sense, this is fortunate. The political expression of the citizen is his final verdict of approval or disapproval as respects the government under which he lives. The American voter, possessed of a higher average of intelligence than is enjoyed by his fellow-men throughout the world, and with a fine capacity for discrimination, reviews the actions of those who have been placed in authority, and sweeps from power the offenders against his judgment. The time is approaching when the decision of the great national jury will again be invoked. On that day of reckoning the citizen will not be forced to decide, as he has been for more than a third of a century, between various phases of economic and financial problems. For the moment at least, these questions have been relegated to the rear, and graver matters confront him. He must determine for himself whether the war was justly waged, whether it has been properly conducted, and, most important of all, whether the future policy of the United States is to be broad and liberal or narrow and insular.

The war has marked a turning-point in the destiny of the American Republic; and it now remains for the individual at the ballot-box to decide whether the nation shall press forward along the paths which open alluringly into a field of wider power, or shall deliberately ignore the plain manifestation of destiny and remain bound in the swaddling-clothes of eternal infancy. In this comprehensive sense, therefore, the political aspect of the war is more significant and engrossing, more important in its effect upon future history, than any other factor concerned in the struggle. The thunder of guns at Manila and Santiago has ceased: the mustered-out soldier is returning home. Presently the dropping of the ballot will be the echo of the noisy engines of human destruction. In the meantime it may not be inappropriate to discuss some of the political considerations which have marked the beginning and the progress of the conflict and which will have their weight in determining the conclusion that will be reached.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may, in the first place, be set down as an axiom, that if the war had not been fought, the Administration of President McKinley would have been wrecked. Anyone who has read American history, and knows the temper and spirit of the American people, must admit this assertion without argument. John Adams, it will be remembered, labored successfully to avert a war with France, and then paid dearly for his well-directed and humane efforts. At the same time, it would be foolish and unjust even to intimate that President McKinley was influenced in the least by this political consideration. Prominent leaders in his party, as I know personally, were dominated by this idea, foreseeing campaign victories as the result of a war; but the President would gladly have averted the conflict, if he could have done so with honor to the country, without regard to the effect of such action upon his political future. In this, however, the present President is not peculiar. It is a curious and at the same time a gratifying fact, that the election of an American citizen to the high office of the Presidency invests him with a sense of national responsibility which no one can appreciate who has not seen it exemplified, as I have done, in many Presidents. There have been some occasions, undoubtedly, when the Chief Executives have elevated party above country; but these instances have been so few and they have provoked such universal condemnation as to prove the rule. In the case of President McKinley the desire to administer his office for the welfare of the entire country has been especially paramount.

The politics of the war began in St. Louis in 1896, when the Republican party, in national convention assembled, unanimously passed a series of resolutions declaring the conditions existent in Cuba to be intolerable, and that, the Government of Spain having lost control of the island, it was the duty of the United States to interfere in order to restore peace and give independence. The Democrats likewise declared their sympathy for the struggling Cubans, and were, therefore, pledged in advance to support any efforts which looked toward the amelioration of oppressive conditions in Cuba. When, after the inauguration of a Republican President, the sympathy which the Democrats had invoked took a definite and official form, they could not, in all fairness, array themselves in opposition. As a matter of fact, and to their credit be it said, they did not assume the attitude of obstructionists. Aware that successful war in the United States has always inured to the benefit of the political party inaugurating it, they, nevertheless, stood gallantly and enthusiastically by the President's side. There was, it is true, some differ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence of opinion between the Republican and Democratic leaders in Congress as to the minor detail of whether the insurgent Government in Cuba should be officially recognized; but even in this division there was a notable absence of party lines. Republicans and Democrats alike voted for the resolutions which made the war inevitable; and, on the other hand, Republicans and Democrats were ranged together in opposition. The voices of Senator Wellington, of Maryland, and Senator White, of California,—the one a Republican, and the other a Democrat,—echoed across the Senate aisle in denouncing the approaching conflict.

The war with Spain was not, therefore, the offspring of partisan politics. Neither party can justly claim the credit of its inauguration. It was, in this regard, unlike the Civil War, for and against which the Republican and Democratic parties arrayed themselves in almost solid phalanxes. The abolition of slavery was the cardinal principle of the Republican party alone: the rescue of Cuba from Spanish tyranny and oppression was urged by all parties with equal emphasis. The American spirit, regardless of differences upon purely political questions, revolted against the continuance of inhuman conditions at the country's very threshold, even as it welcomed Kosciusko as the living embodiment of a people seeking freedom, and applauded Daniel Webster, seventy years ago, when he eloquently pleaded the cause of the Revolutionists in Greece. The unanimity with which the emergency defence fund of $50,000,000 was voted in Congress also demonstrated that party lines were obliterated, and that behind the President was a united and sympathetic people.

Having shown, satisfactorily I hope, that no partisan advantage can be claimed by either side for the inauguration of the war, we reach the point where responsibility and credit are no longer divided. The conduct of the war rests entirely upon Republican shoulders. In the executive branch of the Government the Democrats have no voice whatever; and the glory of successful management, or the shame of official corruption and incompetency, must be visited upon the Republican Administration alone. It becomes interesting and important, therefore, to consider the manner in which a Republican President and a Republican Administration met the duty devolving upon them.

Here we have two points of view, the general and the individual. The former embraces, of course, the broad questions of national policy: the latter relates to personal selection and preferment.

As for the first, speaking from the standpoint of an impartial observer, and with a more or less intimate knowledge of the daily happenings

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the White House, I desire to say that I believe no President could be freer from narrow and bigoted partisanship than Mr. McKinley. He has never sought to turn the national duty of freeing Cuba into political capital for the Republican party. (He was tempted to do so more than once by designing politicians at his elbow, whose devotion to party was more earnest than wise; but their selfish and unpatriotic advice he, happily, spurned.) On the contrary, I know, from a personal conversation with the President, that to him the most glorious outcome of the war is the disappearance of the last vestige of sectionalism. Intensely patriotic, as sentimental in many things as a woman, he is proud that in his Administration there has come the absolute reuniting of the nation. Beside this one great result, all the honors and achievements of the war are to him as naught. As compared with the solidification of the Republic, the acquisition of territory and the brilliant record of the army and the navy upon land and sea are insignificant.

How has it been, however, with the selection of individuals to fill the innumerable offices made necessary by the war? I know that on this point opinions differ and will continue to differ, despite all that may be said on either side. There have been currently bruited in the press—mostly the opposition press—all manner of charges concerning the diversion of Presidential power into political channels. We have heard much of "great men's sons" being appointed to fat offices; and those of us who live in Washington know from experience that the "pie counter" attracted a hungry and persistent horde. For a time, a mercenary and selfish, rather than a patriotic, spirit seemed to animate a very large contingent of American citizens. It was a deplorable exhibition which this mob of office-seekers made; but it was offset, happily, by the noble spectacle of tens of thousands of young men hastening to join the ranks as self-sacrificing, ill-paid, and unknown volunteers. It is also a fact worthy of emphasis, that many of the unsuccessful applicants for military office contented themselves with places of lower degree. There were not many of these instances, it is true. But we must remember that ten righteous men would have saved Sodom and Gomorrah; and it is pleasant to know that all of the office-seekers were not actuated by purely selfish motives.

In the few months immediately following the inauguration of a President, when every moment of his time should be occupied in familiarizing himself with the details of government, he is compelled to devote himself to finding places for his adherents. At the opening of the war, when the President might naturally have been expected to be en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grossed in the consideration of gravest problems, Mr. McKinley found himself called upon to fill a multitude of offices which the sudden assembling of a large volunteer army and the enlargement of the regular force had created. As already intimated, there was no lack of applications. In the War Department alone over 150,000 letters were received from candidates and friends of candidates. It was a physical impossibility for the President or the Secretary of War, overwhelmed with all-important duties, personally to examine all these communications. Some system had to be devised whereby the labor of the President could be lightened, and the honors at the same time be equitably distributed, with due regard always to the best interests of the country. It was, therefore, decided, that the Senators and Representatives should present to the President the names of those persons whose appointment would be satisfactory to them. It was to be supposed that Republicans and Democrats alike would endorse men of their own political persuasion; and the supposition naturally proved to be correct. In this manner the President dispensed official favors without regard to party; and I am informed by the Adjutant-General of the Army, through whose hands all papers connected with the issuance of commissions passed, that in no case did the President inquire as to the politics of an appointee.

It may be objected, however, that this plan, even without the President's direct participation, encompassed all appointments with the atmosphere of political influence. Of course it did. No one denies—no one, so far as I know, desires to deny—that influence secured the prizes for which so many earnestly sought; but how else should the appointments have been made? Through the tedious routine of civil service examinations, when every moment counted in placing the army in the field? By personal examination by the President of thousands upon thousands of letters from unknown writers, whose statements as to their qualifications could not have been inquired into and substantiated, except at an enormous loss of time? Surely not. The President very wisely and properly called upon the representatives of the people, irrespective of party, to aid him in the delicate, onerous, and responsible task of selecting officers for the army. He knew from experience the wide acquaintance possessed by each Senator and Representative; and he also knew that these men would be held personally accountable by their constituencies for the selections which they made. It was but fair to presume that they would have sufficient patriotic concern to present only the names of those who were amply qualified to fill the positions for which they were suggested. They had shared with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President the burden of inaugurating the war; they had aided him in the enactment of the necessary legislation; and they were, in turn, invited to assist in the prosecution of the conflict through the persons whose names they submitted for Executive consideration. If many of these Senators and Representatives endorsed incompetent men, or if they selected their sons and other relatives for official preferment, it was a matter which rested upon their own consciences. If there is to be a rebuke, it must be administered by the people at the polls in November to those callous public servants who regarded the war as affording an unequalled opportunity for installing their *protégés* into Government jobs.

It has been asserted that the President could have avoided all exercise of political influence by utilizing the officers of the regular army. Let us examine the records. There are eighteen major-generals of volunteers. Of these, thirteen are from the regular army, every brigadier-general having been promoted without exception; while of the five civilians, all were distinguished officers of the Civil War, and three of them, Lee, Wheeler, and Butler, served on the Confederate side. There are seventy brigadier-generals. Forty-three of them were colonels in the regular army; and the remaining twenty-seven from civil life were men of excellent military record. In the assignments to duty in the Adjutant-General's Office the same generous treatment of regular officers was shown; but in the Quartermaster's, Commissary, and Medical departments the proportion of civilian appointments was, of course, very large. The exact figures may prove of value. They are as follows:

	From the Army.	From Civil Life.
Major-Generals	13	5
Brigadier-Generals	43	27
Adjutant-General's Office	62	43
Inspector-General's Office	19	12
Judge-Advocate-General's Office	3	5
Quartermaster's Department, all grades	45	77
Commissary Department " "	21	92
Medical Department " "	36	47
Paymaster-General's Office	1	85
Engineers	22	6
Ordnance	26	..
Signal Corps	23	81
	314	480

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is worth while to note the fact, not apparent in the above table, that the early appointments in each branch of the military service were of officers in the regular army, who were thus promoted to more responsible duties and higher pay. Upon this foundation of military experience the President rested his civilian corps. The appointment of the latter in the Quartermaster's, Commissary, Medical, and Pay branches of the service was absolutely necessary; there being scarcely enough officers in the miniature regular army to attend properly to its necessities. Even in selecting three hundred and twenty officers the President barely avoided crippling the service. Many of the companies of regulars served with less than their quota of commissioned officers; and in some cases a non-commissioned officer was in command. Had the President advanced every officer of the regular force to a higher position in the volunteer service, he would have been compelled to appoint large numbers of civilians to fill the lower grades,—men without training or discipline, lacking essential experience in the management of veteran troops, and whose installation into the regular army would have prevented the promoted officers from returning to their proper rank at the close of the war.

In the selection of army officers for advancement personal favoritism was undoubtedly shown; but this is the way of the world. The proprietor of a large business establishment gives employment to the son of his old friend rather than to an entire stranger, even if all other things are not equal; and Presidents and Secretaries, like other men, are influenced by human sympathies. Granting, however, that this is true; admitting that in many instances the President and the Secretary of War bestowed favors upon men with whom their associations were of an intimate and personal nature, is it for a moment to be believed that they would sacrifice the honor of the country or the *prestige* of the American army on the altar of personal consideration? To entertain this idea for a single instant is to attribute to them a degree of perfidy beyond comprehension. It is charged, for example, that Secretary Alger appointed Gen. Shafter to the command of the campaign against Santiago because the latter was a Michigan man, and because his selection would materially promote the Secretary's political fortunes in that State. Apart from the absurdity of the logic of this proposition,—for Gen. Shafter had long since left Michigan, and exercised no influence there,—it is not reasonable to suppose that the Secretary of War would deliberately court disaster through the appointment of an incompetent commander simply because that officer happened to be a native of his own

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State. In the same scale with personal acquaintance and knowledge there must have been an honest belief that the officer would prove himself capable of performing his duty most bravely and successfully. To harbor any other idea is to accuse the appointing power of being a traitor to his country and to insure for him an execration which no public official would wantonly invite.

Political influence, or, rather, the influence of politicians, secured positions in the army. Was the result unsatisfactory? There has been, as I think everyone will agree, a serious exhibition of mismanagement and inefficiency in the army. If the root of the trouble lies in the exercise of political influence, however, it must be traced further back than the appointments made to meet the exigencies of the recent war. The primal difficulty is with the system in the army which allows the President discretion in the promotion of all officers above the rank of colonel. In the navy advancement is based upon seniority. When a vacancy occurs a captain steps from the head of his grade to the bottom of the list of commodores; and no official power can either retard or hasten his upward movement. In the army the conditions are different. The President can to-day take any colonel, no matter how low the latter may be in the army list, and promote him to a vacancy in the column of brigadier-generals; while to-morrow, if occasion offers, he may elevate the newly made brigadier to a major-generalship and assign him to the command of the entire army. This system, breeding the cultivation of "political pull," has resulted in placing at the head of the important bureaus of the War Department those officers whose influence with the President was most potential.

In time of peace this policy of selection, although radically wrong, worked no hardship, injury, or scandal, because the ostensible head of the bureau suffered its work to be performed by those subordinates whose long acquaintance with its routine made them fully capable. In the emergency of war, however, when experience, ability, foresight, and unerring judgment were demanded at every hour of the day, these favorites of political fortune were sadly out of their element. It is these high officers, and not the "great men's sons," upon whom the blame of inefficiency must fall. As a matter of fact, the almost universal verdict is that the new appointees entered upon their duties with enthusiasm, with minds fresh from contact with the busy world, and with the ambition to achieve a creditable record. The baneful effect of political influence is visible higher up in the scale than in these acquisitions to the military force. One lesson from the consideration of poli-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tics in the war, therefore, is that promotions in the army should be entirely free from political considerations, and should be based, as in the navy, upon seniority alone. It is interesting to observe that in the one instance where the navy departed from its safe and admirable rule, and gave Admiral Sampson what is humorously called "gunboat commission," advancing him by bureaucratic favor in disregard of his actual rank, the experiment has resulted in a public scandal. The undisguised favoritism shown to Admiral Sampson is the only blot on the fair name of the navy to-day; and this stain could have been avoided by a strict observance of a proper and sensible policy.

Far more important than this political point of view from its individual side is the effect which the war will have upon parties and platforms in the future. The limit of this article has, however, been reached, and its concluding views must be briefly stated. It has already been asserted that if the war had not been fought, the Administration of President McKinley would have been wrecked upon the rock of popular disfavor. The converse of this proposition, however, is not necessarily inevitable; but the probability is that history will repeat itself. Every Administration which has waged war has been endorsed by the people. The Civil War intrenched the Republican party in power for twenty years; and the same organization will undoubtedly be the beneficiary of the recent struggle. It will claim the credit of awakening a national spirit, of developing a pride in the acquisition of territory, and of stimulating a sense of greatness that is as novel as it is thrilling; and this claim will be very generally allowed. The Democratic party has two alternatives. It must either combat the policy of national expansion, or it must accept the situation and look elsewhere for campaign issues. If it adopts the former course it will put itself in the position of retarding national progress, of obstructing the onward course of events. This would be unpopular, in the present state of public feeling; while its acceptance of a colonial policy would be an endorsement of the Republican party. I doubt very much whether, in the exhilaration of acquiring new territory, the public mind will turn with patience to a resurrection of the doctrine of the free coinage of silver. Consequently, the political effect of the war upon the country will undoubtedly be advantageous to the party represented in the Administration which conducted it to a successful issue.

Only one cloud disturbs the serenity of this outlook for the Republicans; but already the cloud is larger than a man's hand. The evils of the military administration seem to have been great. With or with-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out reason, the country is aroused by the stories of ill-treatment related by returning soldiers. Herein the Democrats naturally find a battle-cry of opposition. The Wisconsin Democrats "condemn in unstinted measures the War Department for the blunders and crimes committed against the brave boys in blue in camp and on foreign battle-fields by selfish contractors, incompetent surgeons, and vain, heartless army officers, appointed for political purposes"; and the New Hampshire Democrats demand an investigation by Congress "and the summary punishment of the men who have prostituted patriotism to partisanship and greed."

If the people, between now and November, shall become convinced that the Republican Administration is responsible for the unnecessary suffering endured by our splendid soldiers, the rebuke administered at the polls will be emphatic and severe.

HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DANGERS OF IMPERIALISM.

ONE of the prominent characteristics of American politics, which writers and speakers have frequently remarked, is the lack in recent years of any very fundamental differences in the tenets of the great political parties. Since, indeed, the question of slavery ceased to have other than historic interest, no political question at all comparable to that in intensity or divisive force has arisen. Neither the rehabilitation of the Southern States, nor the adjustment of tariff duties (though quite the first in importance of *post bellum* issues) ever made the same powerful appeal to the national thought that long characterized the earlier issue of slavery. And the reason is not far to seek. A question of public policy whose main interest is intellectual, which appeals primarily to men of education or fruitful experience, or concerns the choice of means to the attainment of some end generally regarded as desirable, can never become a ground of radical distinction between parties. A real issue, whatever its other elements, must take strong hold of the moral sense, must touch the feelings and emotions, and color, for better or worse, the views of the national mission and ideal entertained by the mass of the people. Something of this moral appeal, impossible in connection with any purely administrative question, has attached to the latest of our party issues, in the growing opinion that the maintenance of a sound currency is not alone a matter of scientific determination of standards, but a matter of national honesty and good faith as well.

There seems to be good reason for thinking that, as one result of our unhappy war with Spain, American politics has at last been provided with a real and living issue. Under the taking name of "imperialism," the people of the United States find themselves suddenly confronted with a question of national policy of profound significance and far-reaching relations. It is not a question of administrative detail, or of mere choice of means, or of observance of scientific law. It is not a question on which individual opinion must be guided wholly by extensive technical information. It is a question, rather, of our national hopes and desires, of our place and work in the world, of what

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we wish our America to become. In all our history no question has been presented to us whose answer may so radically change the face of our national life. How vital the issue is felt to be, how widely it is being discussed, is clear to any thoughtful observer. It bids fair to unite North and South, East and West, at the same time that it runs athwart existing party lines, and causes a man's foes to be those of his own political household. Such a situation as is presented in Massachusetts—where the two Republican Senators, each prominent in the councils of his party, occupy diametrically opposite positions on the question—is significant of the power of this new idea.

I understand by imperialism, in the best sense in which the term is used, a theory of national policy in accordance with which the United States is to add to its territorial possessions, for the purpose of extending American trade and American political influence. We are to change our traditional policy of independence and non-participation in the general politics of the world, and to adopt a policy of territorial expansion, of wide contact and control. We are to have colonies and dependencies, coaling-stations and "keys." Incidentally, we are to get military and naval influence, and a reputation for physical prowess, not for purposes of wanton aggression, but to command wholesome respect. I do not understand that imperialism means political tyranny or meddlesomeness, or greedy scrambling for territory, or offensive and defensive alliances, but rather the extension, by reasonable and honorable means, of American influence and control beyond the North American continent. To use a hard-worked phrase, it is a policy of extensive, rather than intensive, growth. It is the cosmopolitan and international, as opposed to the provincial, idea.

Without discussing further the general nature of this new issue, or its theoretical bearings upon politics in a democracy, I propose to consider some of the dangers which seem to me to be inseparable from the pursuit of such a policy by the United States.

I. The right of the United States to acquire and govern territory is no longer open to discussion, nor is the particular method to be followed in either case a subject for other than academic debate. In the absence of any constitutional provision, the question of acquisition has been settled by precedent. Jefferson, to be sure, sought to quiet his strict-constructionist conscience by empty talk about a suitable constitutional amendment; but nothing came of it, nor has the matter been at any time seriously considered. The method, too, has been determined by the occasion. We obtained Louisiana and Alaska by pur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chase, occupied Florida by force, took California and New Mexico as spoils of war, and annexed Texas and Hawaii by joint resolution. For the government of acquired territory, also, warrant has been found in the clause of the Constitution giving Congress power "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." Whether this clause contemplated "territory" or "Territories" is, again, a question of only historic interest. The doubt was early resolved in favor of the right of Congress to organize territorial governments in new regions, to give to those governments such form as it chose, and to continue the territorial status as long as seemed expedient. For the administration of new territory to any point short of statehood, therefore, there is undoubted constitutional sanction, as also for giving to new possessions any form of government deemed best, whether it be the familiar territorial form long in use or some other.

While, however, Congress, in matters in which it is given discretion, is not bound to follow its own precedents, precedents nevertheless count for much in history and law. And one precedent in our dealings with Territories, of especial significance in connection with this new issue of imperialism, has been the general assumption, confirmed by long practice, of the merely temporary status of a territorial organization. It has always been distinctly understood that a territorial government was preliminary to statehood, and was to give way to a State organization as soon as the size of the population warranted. The idea of a *permanent* Territory, with no prospect of ultimate recognition as a State, and subject indefinitely to the immediate control of Congress, is foreign alike to our theory and our practice. We have never so dealt with any people subject to our jurisdiction and recognized by us as citizens, nor have we ever manifested any disposition to do so.

One serious danger of imperialism, accordingly, is in the likelihood of pressure from our new acquisitions for admission to the Union as States. To admit them, sooner or later, is, as we have seen, to follow a long line of precedents; to debar them is to adopt a wholly new theory of national policy. The objections to the admission of Hawaii, for example (or of any other region we are likely to acquire), as a State, with Senators and Representatives in Congress, participation in presidential elections, and an equal voice in the conduct of national affairs, are many and cogent; and it is not surprising that some of the foremost advocates of an imperial America have hastened to declare in advance against such admission. When, however, we recall the circumstances under which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some of the present States have been hurried into the Union, and the arguments adduced in support of such action, it cannot be doubted that the pressure brought to bear would be very great. On the other hand, the permanent government of outlying districts as colonies in fact, though not in name, is so far foreign to our historic usage, and rests upon so different a theory of national organization, that the adoption of such a course might well be fraught with grave menace to our whole constitutional system.

II. Closely connected with this danger of forced admission of detached States is the danger of the abandonment, or, at least, the radical modification, of our belief in universal suffrage. The theory, that all adult male citizens of sound mind and independent status have a right to participate in the conduct of affairs, has been one of the most important and most distinctive bases of our political life. It was not the theory of our fathers, nor had it the sanction of any enlightened nation at the time our Constitution was framed; yet it has steadily and successfully made its way, and has long been regarded, in common thought, as one of the peculiar glories of our system. The emancipation of the negroes, thrusting upon the body politic a horde of human beings previously regarded, in law, alternately as chattels and as real estate, and to whom the status of "persons," within the meaning of the Constitution, had been denied by the Supreme Court, strained the doctrine to the utmost, and put the faith of its defenders to the severest test: but the argument from necessity overrode the argument from political philosophy; and the suffrage was extended to the blacks on the same terms as to the whites. Aside from the abolition of slavery, probably no single result of the Civil War has been more highly praised, or oftener cited as proof of far-seeing political wisdom, than this.

Yet it is not difficult to see that one of the strongest arguments against the admission, as a State, of such a dependency as Hawaii, involves a denial of universal suffrage as a measure of universal application. We shrink from entrusting political control to dark-skinned Hawaiians of uncertain pedigree and problematic civilization, for the same reason that we hesitate to entrust it to Cubans. The notion of equality, inseparable from the idea of universal suffrage, seems, in these mixed populations, to be hardly borne out by the facts. Here, again, the advocates of imperialism have already entered upon the new road. Their leaders are already telling us that "of course" the suffrage must be restricted, that "we cannot think" of putting the ballot into the hands of such people for other than local affairs, and that it is "out of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the question" to consider giving to the Hawaiians and others a voice in national concerns.

I can but think that the Imperialists, however far removed from theoretical consistency, are at this point in close accord with common sense. At the same time, the logical application of the new doctrine is likely, I fear, to bring some unexpected and not wholly beneficent consequences. One need not admit all the extravagant claims of its extreme advocates, or ignore the objections of its extreme opponents, to realize that universal suffrage, as worked out in the United States, has served to stimulate profoundly the desire for individual betterment. It has not, as some predicted, saved American politics from corruption, nor freed us from the control of the spoilsman; but unquestionably it has deepened the sense of political responsibility, conduced to a higher average of citizenship, and extended to all the hand of hopefulness and cheer. Any attempt, accordingly, to deal with the people of our new possessions on terms less liberal than we have thus far accorded to the lowest elements in our own cosmopolitan population, can hardly be construed otherwise than as a withdrawal from our present advanced position, or operate otherwise than as an argument in favor of a restriction of the suffrage in certain States of the Union, particularly in the South, and as a check on democratic progress the world over. Universal suffrage for continental Americans, however ignorant and degraded, and restricted suffrage for Hawaiian Americans and others, would be a combination whose reactionary effect might well be feared.

III. In the third place, an imperial policy is a costly policy. Just as there are gifts which may impoverish the recipient, or compel a radical change in his accustomed mode of life, so there are opportunities of which even a wealthy nation may not avail itself without assuming a heavy financial burden. The great example of colonial expansion is England; and much recent discussion of England's place as a World-Power proceeds on the assumption that, since England is rich and powerful, and has numerous dependencies, the dependencies have been a source of wealth. The reasoning itself is specious; and the assertion is not confirmed by the facts. Instead of being a mine of wealth to the mother-country, the English colonies have become so great a source of expense that statesmen have wondered whether the load could be much longer borne. Any colony, especially one in such an economic condition as Hawaii or any of the Spanish possessions, is sure to make large drafts on the home treasury, not alone in outright grants for necessary internal improvements, but in financial concessions none the less costly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because less readily traced. No colony, in its beginnings, can stand alone. Further, a colony must be defended; and that means fortifications, troops, and a large and efficient navy, the larger part of the cost of which must be defrayed by the mother-country. The ordinary charges of territorial administration, also, are considerable; and these, too, if we regard our uniform practice, will be wholly or largely borne by the United States. We shall have to build capitols, prisons, and court-houses, improve rivers and harbors, subsidize railroads, survey public lands, pay numerous salaries to officials, construct forts and barracks, provide soldiers and munitions of war, and guard the coasts. In short, the adoption of a policy of territorial expansion, even upon a moderate scale, means the adoption of a new scale of national taxation and expenditure, and opens the way to administrative outlays, direct and indirect, greatly in excess of those to which we are now accustomed.

I suppose there can be little doubt but that the people of the United States are able to pay much higher taxes than they now pay. We do not commonly think of ourselves as overtaxed: certainly, in comparison with some other nations, the burden of governmental contributions cannot be said to rest very heavily upon us. The point to be attended to, however, in considering an imperialistic programme, lies in another direction. It has been more than once pointed out that, under a *régime* of vastly increased national expenditure, the sources of revenue provided by the Constitution have begun to show significant limitations. There are indications, political and economic, that tariff taxes have reached very nearly their maximum-point, and that we can no longer hope to meet increased appropriations by the simple device of "raising the tariff." We have at present a scale of duties at which our protectionist fathers would have looked aghast; nevertheless we have a deficit. Further, so long as the opinion of the Supreme Court remains unchanged, it seems impossible to frame a suitable income tax, while the Constitution in terms prevents the levying of any direct tax not susceptible of apportionment among the States in accordance with population. There are left, then, the two resources of indirect internal taxation and an increase of the national debt, upon both of which the war with Spain has forced us to draw heavily. In all probability, we have for the present seen an end to payment of the national debt, and a beginning of heavier internal taxation.

I regard the financial cost of imperialism, then, as a danger, not so much because of the increased burden it will lay upon the people, as because of its possible influence upon the national temper. The ques-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion is not whether we are able to pay, but whether it is worth while to pay. I do not find myself in accord with those who regard a national debt as a national blessing, and the payment of heavy taxes as *prima facie* evidence of prosperity. If, in order to avoid a recurring deficit, internal taxation is to be relied upon more and more, then we must expect to see the inquisitorial and vexatious side of taxation become more and more apparent. Not only shall we have less profit from our industry, but our earnings will be levied upon in more grievous ways. And with the chafing of the load goes the increasing restlessness with which it is borne—a spirit less buoyant and hopeful, a less pronounced sense of getting on in the world, a keener realization of the hardness of life. Unless the added weight of taxation can be offset by enlarged opportunities for capital and labor, and the tangible evidences of material prosperity still increase among us, the possession of islands in the Atlantic or Pacific, or coaling-stations in the Philippines or the Ladrones, may well come to seem too dearly bought.

IV. I have spoken of imperialism as the manifestation of a desire for intimate and influential relations with world affairs. Such relations are, indeed, a necessary result of territorial expansion. Yet it is open to question whether our habits have been such as to fit us for immediate success in such a sphere. Our long freedom from "entangling alliances," and our ability to conduct our affairs with little danger of collision with other Powers, while allowing remarkable liberty of action, have tended also to develop an easy-going habit of mind, and a comfortable willingness to make the best of unfavorable conditions. The particular illustration of this spirit is to be seen in the general indifference to purity and effectiveness in governmental administration. The idea of trained service, strict business methods, and absence of personal or party favoritism in the administration of government has grown but slowly in the United States. Public office has been too largely public plunder, and the spoils system has too effectually blunted the moral sense, to give to the obligations of government routine a very vivid appeal.

It is against this general apathy, and its resulting demoralization, that the agitation for civil service reform and the abolition of corrupt political practices has been mainly directed. We have heard so much of late about these two movements, and have seen such notable results accomplished in their name, that we may easily make the mistake of attributing to them a strength and permanence which they do not possess. I am still much inclined to doubt whether the theory involved in civil service reform is as yet sincerely accepted by any considerable num-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber of our leading public men, or has a very secure hold of a large proportion of voters. Like many similar programmes, its success is distinctly out of proportion to the volume of its support. Certainly the present unblushing opposition, in some sections of the Republican party, to any further extension of the system, together with an announced willingness to reduce the area of its operation, seems to point to a limit beyond which the reform may, for a time, be unable to go. That we are far from having attained the ordinary, every-day purity long characteristic of English political life is only too painfully shown by the notorious corruption intrenched in such States as New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, and in such cities as New York and Philadelphia.

What sort of a civil service would a policy of imperialism demand? What sort of a civil service would probably be put in operation were that policy definitely entered upon to-day? We have not, nor has anyone in authority suggested, in this connection, that we ought to have, arrangements for the systematic training of candidates for the consular and diplomatic services; neither have we seriously contemplated the establishment of an administrative system such as has made English colonial management so signally successful. In the present condition of public spirit and political morality in this country, there is but too much reason to fear that new possessions, like the old, will fall under the control of the spoilsman, and be administered in the interest of the "machine." How great may be our latent capacity for dealing with new international relations, with their selfish rivalries and numberless points of hostile contact, no one, perhaps, would venture to say; but to turn over to a "boss" or a "leader" the political patronage of a distant dependency could hardly fail to insure, only on a larger scale, the same pernicious incapacity and lamentable maladministration which, but a short time ago, sent American troops to Cuba with antiquated rifles and inadequate supplies, and left sick and well alike to succumb like cattle to starvation and disease.

I know of nothing that strikes more surely at the foundations of national success than indifference to the conduct of ordinary administrative affairs, and toleration of dishonesty in political management. They make impossible for us the things we most desire. Anxious as we may be to occupy a large place in the world's eye, to deal skilfully with great interests, to unravel complicated situations, and to shape in some degree the course of civilization, we sacrifice the essential ability to do so by neglect of the only means by which permanent success on a large field can ever be attained. England has succeeded, primarily, because Eng-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lishmen have come to regard government as a serious business, to be engaged in with deliberation, and prosecuted with all the aid obtainable from thorough training, long experience, and rigid legal safeguards. We in America, on the contrary, have never taken the business of government much to heart, nor viewed the administration of political affairs as other than a necessary evil. And it may very well be that this new issue of imperialism will bring no greater danger than that of delaying the overthrow, within our present borders, of a political *morale* which has brought us nothing but evil, and against which we still need to fight with all our strength.

V. It may be pointed out that a policy of imperialism, consistently adhered to and logically developed, is not in harmony with the historic spirit of American government. The remarkable stability of the Constitution of the United States has often been noted, particularly by European observers. The century since 1789 has been preëminently a time of constitution-making. All the national written constitutions now in existence have been framed since our own. France, in the same time, has had many constitutions. Of the original thirteen States, Massachusetts alone retains the constitution with which it entered the Union. But the Constitution of the United States remains in form essentially what it was in 1789. Ten amendments, satisfying the popular desire for a bill of rights, were added in 1791, and two others in 1798 and 1804; then two generations passed before the list was completed with the amendments of 1865, 1868, and 1870. With all the widening of national interests, and the complicated relations of modern industrial and political life, no proposition to revise the Constitution has ever been seriously entertained.

The Constitution was made for the United States, however, and not the United States for the Constitution; and it cannot be doubted that respect for an honorable past would not avail against a demand for new powers adequate to changed needs. That American government, as at present constituted, has, from an imperial standpoint, obvious shortcomings has already begun to be pointed out. To hang practically the whole administration of colonial possessions, in whatever form, upon the single grant of power "to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory" of the United States, is to suspend it by a slender thread. To annex Hawaii by joint resolution because annexation by treaty could not be secured, is not best defended by citing the precedent of Texas, or pleading the right of Congress to act according to its mind. An executive closely dependent upon the legislature, and lacking large powers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of initiative, is ill-fitted to manage complicated foreign interests, or to maintain the secrecy and reserve frequently indispensable to diplomatic success; while the want of continuity in immediate foreign policy, due to frequent changes of diplomatic agents, and an arbitrary change of administration once in four years, puts the United States at a disadvantage in dealing with other Powers whose diplomacy suffers no such arbitrary breaks. In the absence of a permanent civil service at home and abroad, covering all offices not strictly political in character, the changing aspects of party politics would be a constant menace. There would certainly be need of clearer definition of the taxing-power, of the citizen status of colonial peoples, and of the obligation of the House of Representatives to support an executive policy.

What the advocates of imperialism, who consider the constitutional bearings of their plea, have in mind is the Cabinet system of government; and it is this which, under one pretence or another, we are asked to contemplate as a substitute for the system we now have. It cannot be denied that the English Cabinet system has many marked advantages for a nation with wide international relations; and I suppose few would insist that the adoption of such a system in the United States would mean the wreck of the Republic. It is rather with the dangers involved in change of any sort that I am here concerned. It is a perilous thing to alter the structure of a government: it is scarcely less perilous to bring about deliberately a state of affairs in which the need of such alteration shall be generally and seriously discussed. For the suggestion of change, when accompanied by favoring circumstances, opens up to the national vision the evils present in the great convention of 1787, and in nearly every similar State convention since—the evils, namely, of clashing interests, of antagonistic theories, of selfishness, corruption, and intrigue. Of all the dangers that imperialism could bring, I can think of none greater than this, that we should lose confidence in the government which has worked for us so well, and seek, through a new constitution, support for a policy which as yet has position without development, and which stands for our ambitions rather than for our logical necessities.

I recall that the American Republic, founded at a time when monarchy and caste ruled the world, was established by statesmen whose idea of what their country was to be was not the less definite because their grants of national power were often couched in general terms. I recall how the Constitution, conceived in discord, born of compromise, and nurtured in the face of opposition at home and contemptuous dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regard abroad, has unified the nation, carried us successfully through foreign and domestic war, fostered our industry and trade, spread material prosperity throughout the land, and given to each succeeding generation a heritage of peace, opportunity, and good-will. Distant by an ocean from the life of the Old World, and with a wilderness to conquer, we have nevertheless grown in knowledge, in refinement, in intellectual and moral resources. We have resolutely refrained from interference with the political affairs of other nations, and as resolutely resisted attempts to interfere with our own. If, as a people, we have never fully attained moral consistency, or freed ourselves wholly from those who would make our virtues a means to selfish aggrandizement, we have yet stood, in a peculiar sense and in a large way, for the best aspirations, the cleanest and healthiest political and social ambitions, of the human race. More than any other people, we have achieved political independence, abstained from international strife, spread education and enlightenment, cared for the poor and oppressed, and raised the standard of living for the mass of the people.

I cannot avoid the conclusion that some large measure of our success, in these several regards, has been due to the form of government under which we have lived, and to the national limitations which, from the beginning, we have set for ourselves. And I cannot think with indifference of the likelihood of change in these respects. We have no political ills to be remedied by foreign enlargement, and no political gains yet visible commensurate with the risks involved. We have no lack of territory, no pressure of population, no limited resources, and no want of respect from the world at large. If at any time we have been disliked abroad or accorded a consideration beneath our due, it has commonly been because of our own irritating acts. Imperial dominion and imperial influence, dissociated from the sordid elements attending them, are fascinating objects of national ambition; but they would be indeed dearly bought if their price were the sacrifice of any of the things which thus far have made us great.

WILLIAM MACDONALD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BISMARCK.

On the night of July 30, 1898, Prince Bismarck passed away. Germany mourned for him as perhaps she had never before mourned for one of her dead; and the whole civilized world sympathized in her bereavement. It is true that the death of Bismarck has not been everywhere deplored as a painful loss. Here and there, indeed, undisguised expressions of relief have been heard. Nor is this astonishing; for powerful natures, such as his, must ever be attended by love and hatred, respect and aversion, gratitude and revenge, even to the brink of the grave. Upon one point, however, all will agree; viz., that in Bismarck probably the greatest man of the century, certainly one of the foremost characters in history, has passed to his final rest.

A personality such as that of the "Iron Chancellor," to be correctly appreciated, must be viewed across the perspective of centuries. Only future generations will be able to form an accurate estimate of the man: they alone will perceive his true relation to his country and to the world at large. We, his contemporaries, however, remember the man as he was, and all the circumstances of his career; and it devolves upon us, who knew him so well, to pay a fitting tribute to his memory.

We Germans can epitomize the achievements of the great statesman in a single sentence: He was the founder of the German Empire. Since the fifteenth century, Spaniards, Frenchmen, and Englishmen, respectively, had established national unity, and had, in turn, stepped to the front as the leading nations of Europe. We Germans, on the other hand, at the very centre of the Continent, remained disrupted and severed; and when Russia, like the others, matured into a Power of the first magnitude, our position became precarious in the extreme. Yet, eventually, the advance from identity of language and culture to political unity was consummated much more rapidly in Germany than elsewhere. Under the leadership of prominent statesmen, with Prince Bismarck at their head, our country finally succeeded in attaining the long-desired goal. More than Elizabeth or Cromwell to England, than Henri IV or Richelieu to France, was Bismarck to us; and therefore, no German, proud of his na-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive land and solicitous for her welfare, should mention the Chancellor's name without gratitude and reverence.

Since the days of Luther, we have been acknowledged as a people ever battling in the forefront for the advancement of true culture. The seed of the Reformation germinated in an educational system which has become the boast of the nation. Men like Goethe and Schiller, Leibnitz and Kant, are not ours alone: they belong to the world. Napoleon I knew not what he undertook when he seriously contemplated the political annihilation of the "nation of poets and thinkers": for the calamitous period of French aggression gave birth to the idea of German unity; and this idea could not be smothered, but spread irresistibly, until it became the ideal of every patriot. Surely, the man who realized for us this long-desired ideal, must have appeared to us like the fairy prince of the fable! He was the magician who from the enchanted mountain drew forth the buried splendor of German unity. So long as one loyal German heart shall beat, this man's name shall live.

Some may be disposed to dispute this assertion by citing the numerous compatriots of the great statesman, who, instead of honoring him, overwhelm him with censure. The work of Bismarck could not have been accomplished without combat; and whoever fights such battles and wins such victories as he did cannot but make irreconcilable enemies. Perhaps a consideration of the views of his opponents will serve to throw additional light upon the achievements of the great Chancellor.

The standing objection to Bismarck's policy is his advocacy of "blood and iron," as a means of national unification. But what means would have been employed by the adherents of the Frankfort Parliament of 1848, and the representatives of popular suffrage?

On March 28, 1849, the King of Prussia was elected Emperor of Germany at Frankfort; 290 votes being cast for, and 248 against him. He refused to accept the office. Could he have been forced? And if so, by what means save weapons? And, supposing the King of Prussia had accepted, how would he have obtained the endorsement of his royal brethren who were not disposed to acknowledge his supremacy—the Emperor of Austria, the Kings of Bavaria, Würtemberg, Saxony, and Hanover, flanked by the 248 members who were against him,—the same adversaries that Bismarck was forced to overthrow in 1866? Such are the facts: it is useless to conceal them. War was imperatively necessary to the establishment of national unity. The real grievance is that this war was conducted by Bismarck in the service of the King and not in obedience to the will of Parliament. It is urged that not royalty, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the people, first took up arms,—the people, who arose in Saxony, Baden, and the Palatinate, in order to enforce the provisions of the Frankfort Parliament, and to coerce the princes into compliance with the popular will.

None but the tyro in history will believe that great political upheavals, such as that by which German unity was secured, can be accomplished without bloodshed. As regards the sacrifice of human life, however, I would point to the circumstance, not generally known, that the remarkable transformation achieved in 1866 was completed without a greater loss of life than was entailed—quite unnecessarily—by the Schleswig-Holstein War of 1848–50.

I here wish to refer to a noteworthy feature of Bismarck's statesmanship. A scion of the old Brandenburg nobility, throughout his entire career every inch a soldier, expert in arms and fearless of spirit, he resolved in the event of failure to seek death upon the field of battle.

Bismarck never conducted a war for its own sake. "The very fear of God should teach us to love peace and to foster it,"—such was the conviction of the Iron Chancellor expressed in his own words. War was with him the means to an end,—a weapon indispensable to the statesman, yet not to remain unsheathed unnecessarily for an instant. That Bismarck at important stages of his career strenuously defended and successfully maintained this attitude, in opposition to the views and desires of the military authorities, is now regarded as certain; and further developments will probably serve to strengthen this conviction.

Bismarck also sought, as far as possible, to reduce the military burdens of the people. Military service was far less exacting at the time of the North German Confederation, and in the early days of the new German Empire, than under the old Prussian *régime*. But foreign pressure, notably the extensive military preparations of France and Russia, forced Germany to increase her armament, until, in 1888, the Chancellor, heartily supported by the unanimous vote of Parliament, carried the measure providing for the reënactment of the old Prussian law of compulsory military service.

Bismarck never exploited his military successes for purposes incompatible with the national welfare. Despite his territorial acquisitions, his was not the spirit of the conqueror. He applied the knife, making a clean incision, so that the wound might heal and leave no scar; and this frequently against the energetic protests of his less moderate followers. In this way alone was it possible to effect, simultaneously with the peace of 1866, an offensive and defensive alliance with the South German States, and to cement, within thirteen years after the sore defeat

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Austria, a union with that country—a union which has welded Central Europe into a political unit far more potent than would have been the ideal German Empire advocated in 1848.

Future historians will relate that Bismarck, by three short and decisive wars, solved for the German people the most difficult international problems of the century; that he freed the northern provinces, which Germany, in an evil hour, was compelled to relinquish to the foreign yoke; that he created the conditions upon which a national fabric could be reared; and that he banished forever from German soil the intermeddling influence of France. Yes, history will quote the words "blood and iron" as irrefutable evidence of the clear-sightedness of him who promptly discerned the only path leading to the desired goal.

"But the founder of our government has hampered the development of its free institutions," is another objection frequently raised in the camp of Bismarck's political opponents. In criticising Bismarck's policy, we should remember that he was born and bred a strict Royalist. He belonged to the greatly vituperated Prussian rural nobility, which, after all (and this is too frequently forgotten), has ever been distinguished by two virtues, invaluable in great emergencies,—military courage and fidelity to the crown.

Bismarck was and remained a pronounced enemy of revolution. Yet, withal, is it not strange that this man, even in his internal policy—so frequently condemned—should have remained susceptible to rising influences; that he should have recognized the demands of the inevitable and accepted the dictum, even against the remonstrances of his party? Yet such was the case. He frequently defended the constitutional rights guaranteed to the people—more particularly after the war of 1866, when he was strongly urged by one of the most powerful parties in Prussia to utilize the situation for the restoration of the former prerogatives of the crown.

Bismarck clearly discerned the advantages of popular representation. Indeed, he frequently asserted that, instead of diminishing the royal power, popular representation, by stimulating the national consciousness, would redound to the advantage of both crown and state. Only those familiar with Prussian tradition can form a conception of the intellectual expansiveness of this man, who could not only accommodate himself to new conditions, but could make these subservient to the great purpose of his life. Thus it was he, the strict Royalist, who dared to found an empire upon the principle of popular suffrage—a most singular and wonderful fate! His opponents, almost without exception, have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

repaid him with base ingratitude, oblivious of their obligation to him; while many of his friends have covered him with censure—whether justly or unjustly, time alone can determine.

Bismarck has been called an enemy of freedom; yet it was he who gave us universal suffrage at a time when but few European nations possessed it. It is true that he consistently opposed the extension of parliamentary privileges beyond set limits. He firmly adhered to the opinion that the rights of the crown had already been sufficiently curtailed and that any further limitation of the monarchical authority would prove subversive of its best interests; and several million Germans of sound judgment concur in this opinion.

That our stable monarchical system is the central pillar upon which rests the welfare of the Empire and the prosperity of the nation, is the firm conviction of the great majority of our citizens. Numerous indications in the life of Europe to-day justify the belief that the monarchical principle, still so deeply rooted in our national consciousness, is truly a precious possession. There have been times when this belief was considerably shaken; and it is to Bismarck that we are indebted for raising it once more to power and distinction. Who in Germany, to-day, longs for French republicanism? "Thank God that the conditions are not with us as in France, and that you still have a King by the grace of God," was the answer of William IV, when a deputation from the Landtag waited upon him in October, 1848. His words, at that time received with incredulity, would to-day meet with ready acceptance; and this change of opinion is undoubtedly due to the influence of Bismarck. History alone can decide which principle has been more conducive to our national prosperity,—the principle of constitutional monarchy represented by our Chancellor, or that which would base our entire political future upon the opinions and sentiments of the masses.

Furthermore, it is urged that a very large proportion of the Fourth Estate was also arrayed against Bismarck, who it is said, never manifested any sympathy for the working-classes; and this complaint frequently proceeds from social reformers beyond the pale of the proletariat. They say, "Bismarck was the originator of the Socialist law; he hindered the enforcement of the Sabbath law; he opposed numerous measures devised for the protection of working-men; he endeavored to prevent the formation of labor organizations; and he was finally deposed because his views on these matters clashed with those of the Emperor." It is strange indeed to consider as devoid of heart the man who once,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the imminent peril of his own life, rescued his lackey from drowning. In a letter, written by Bismarck during the Bohemian campaign, we find the following passage:

"Our men deserve to be kissed—they are so brave, quiet, obedient, and orderly. Although fatigued, hungry, drenched, and almost bare-footed, they are yet friendly toward all. They neither plunder nor burn. They pay what they can afford, and subsist on mouldy bread. Surely there must be a deep fund of godliness among our common people; otherwise this could not be so."

None but those who have a heart for the lowly can write in this vein. That Bismarck, as a landed proprietor, was ever gentle and considerate toward his dependents, is admitted by all. Moreover, he was the founder of that system of insurance which makes provision in case of accident, sickness, and infirmity. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that in the domain of so-called social reform, Bismarck always proceeded slowly and with extreme caution. Nor was there any concealment as to the motives that governed him. He had serious doubts as to the feasibility of direct interference in behalf of the working-classes; believing that such interference would prove detrimental to industrial development, would cripple competition, and would, in the language of the fable, "kill the goose that lays the golden eggs." Surely these scruples were not entirely without foundation. Could words annihilate, socialism would long ago have been squelched by Eugen Richter; and to-day the controversy has resolved itself into a question of concessions. From all this, it appears that Bismarck's views were not entirely unjustifiable, nor his policy entirely reprehensible.

The enmity of the Social-Democracy was perhaps exceeded by that of the "Centrum," a party with which Bismarck long waged deadly feud. While the direct cause of this antagonism cannot be readily ascertained, there can be no doubt that long before the existence of a German Empire, Prussian supremacy in German affairs was hotly contested by the Catholic clergy. This must be evident to all who have glanced, if only superficially, at the polemic literature published during the religious controversy at Cologne and for several years after. While the Catholics were by no means opposed to the unification of Germany, they desired its establishment under a Catholic ruler and with Austria as an integral constituent.

Finally, Bismarck was drawn into the controversy. He could not fail to perceive in official Catholicism the inveterate foe of Prussia and of Prussia's imperial dynasty; and all doubts as to this enmity must have been dispelled when, upon the establishment of the Centrum,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that party sought to incite a crusade for the restoration of Roman supremacy in secular affairs. Thus originated the conflict with Rome, known as the "Culturkampf," in which only a Bismarck could have effected a compromise without loss of *prestige*. To-day the Centrum has acquired enormous power; and this power is due largely to the fact that the party is no longer compelled, as formerly, to deal with the individual parliaments of the several states. So even the Centrum has reason to be grateful for the existence of the Empire.

It is deplorable that in the criticism of economics, party passion and prejudice frequently tend to obscure the noteworthy achievements of Bismarck. Indeed, the Iron Chancellor has been frequently called the inaugurator of the present warfare of interests, the man who raised the price of bread and who, by his protective duties, has thrown the burden upon the lower classes. As if the warfare of interests were confined to Germany! Is it not waged to-day in every part of the civilized world? And as for duties and indirect taxes, are they not considered legitimate and most important sources of revenue wherever the burden of political responsibility rests heavily upon the state? And, after all, was not the economic legislation advocated by Bismarck introduced according to strict parliamentary procedure? Vulgar demagogues may rant as they will; but they cannot controvert what for the last eighteen years has become the earnest conviction of the vast majority of German citizens. What are we coming to, however, when we are no longer disposed to accord our political adversaries the right to their opinion?

I have here indicated the lines along which the opposition to Bismarck's policy has moved. Party passion has sometimes run very high; and much has been done, and more spoken, that the true patriot cannot but recall with pain. It would be erroneous, however, to infer from this that Bismarck's political fabric has become unpopular and that the idea of political unity is waning. The latter, indeed, is daily becoming more firmly rooted; while our new institutions have established a homogeneity of interests unparalleled in our history. Dismemberment may perhaps be advocated by a few reckless individuals; but no party in Germany to-day seriously contemplates the demolition of our national unity and the restoration of the *ancien régime*. The foreign foe who counts upon our disunion is greatly in error. "It was hard to unite the Empire: it will be still harder to rend it asunder," declared Bismarck; and he spoke truly. "Let us lift Germany into the saddle," said he; "she will know how to ride." And events have justi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fied the prediction. The Empire exists; and only with the nation will it perish. Its existence, however, will ever swell the fame of its illustrious founder.

This opinion, which has already obtained a wide acceptance abroad, will be confirmed by posterity. With what distrust was the new Empire received into the brotherhood of nations! It was universally feared that the new Empire would enter upon a career of conquest,—a tendency somewhat unjustly attributed to its mediæval predecessor. Yet all these fears vanished before Bismarck's statesmanship, which transcended the expectations of even the most sanguine. For centuries the entire Continent had suffered from the deplorable political condition existing within its centre. By establishing the unification of Germany, therefore, and by promoting that of Italy, Bismarck contributed largely to the peace of the world. Europe has never known so long a period of peace as that which she has enjoyed since 1871.

That this peace is maintained by vast standing armies,—that all Europe is bristling with guns,—is an undeniable fact, but one easy of explanation. For nearly three centuries, *i.e.*, from Henri IV and Richelieu to Napoleon III and Thiers, the primary aim of French statesmen was the weakening and disintegration of Germany. The policy thus undeviatingly pursued by France, was well formulated by Napoleon in the remark, "Il faut dépayser l'Allemagne."

Regarded from this point of view, Germany was merely a geographical idea. Napoleon recognized only Bavarians and Saxons, Prussians and Suabians, Hessians and Hanoverians: Germans in the wider sense did not exist for him. How bitterly was the second French Empire condemned for its non-intervention during the war of 1866! "The battle of Königgrätz should never have been permitted," was the cry of Thiers and his associates. Thousands of Frenchmen who afterward washed their hands in innocence, at that time fiercely clamored for war. To the last Frenchman, the belief was general that the unification of Germany would portend the downfall of France. Thus, a long and inevitable historical process finally rendered a victory over France imperative to the establishment of German unity.

Undoubtedly we Germans were partly responsible for this state of affairs; for, by reason of our political impotency, we presented a tempting bait to every strong and adventurous neighbor. Throughout a thousand years of our history there was not a trace of any political hatred toward France; nor does such a sentiment exist among us to-day. It was engendered by the tyranny of Louis XIV, fostered by the Repub-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lic, and matured by the aggressions and usurpation of Napoleon I. "Against whom are the Germans still fighting?" inquired Ernest Renan of Leopold von Ranke, after the battle of Sedan. "Against Louis XIV," promptly replied the great historian.

Even after their defeat, Frenchmen could not accustom themselves to the idea of reigning in Europe peaceably at the side of their neighbor, and of withdrawing from all interference in her affairs. Not the rendition of Alsace-Lorraine (by which the integrity of France was by no means destroyed), but the loss of political *prestige* has engendered the idea of "revanche," that constant and serious menace to the peace of Europe.

To have allowed Strasburg and Metz to remain in the possession of France would, in the light of history, have been an egregious error. Bismarck a short time before his death referred to a conversation with William I of Würtemberg (during the French embroglio of 1850), in the course of which the King is said to have declared that Strasburg was nearer to him than Berlin. So we see that the armed peace now prevailing must be maintained, and that Germany, to-day, must still cling to the old maxim of Frederick the Great, "Toujours en vedette."

But the great armament which the new Empire has been compelled to support, has by no means retarded its internal development. In every department of culture, the progress of Germany within the last few decades has been almost unexampled. A broad and rational system of laws, equitably administered, has stimulated the energies of the people, encouraged the spirit of enterprise, and promoted the present extraordinary growth of national prosperity. Leibnitz once said of the German people that their only title to distinction was their diligence. Yet this same people now takes rank among the foremost commercial nations. It is true that this competition has sometimes been unpleasantly felt by our older rivals in the markets of the world. Yet, upon calm reflection, they will acknowledge that, wherever attained, success has been due largely to intrinsic worth.

It is to the efforts of Bismarck, however, that we are indebted for this marvellous progress; for it was he who shaped our present policy of peaceful competition, so aptly expressed in the well-known motto, "Germany desires nothing more than a place in the sunshine by the side of others."

An estimate of Bismarck would be incomplete without some reference to that well-known and incomparable personality, which, once seen, could never be forgotten. The towering figure, powerful frame,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

large head, and mighty brow, all seemed to stamp their possessor as the living embodiment of primeval Teutonism. The bearer of a name old as that of Staufen, Zollern, Habsburg, or Wittelsbach, the descendant of one of the first families that defended the Elben frontier against Slavonian invasion, yet mingling in his veins the fresh blood of more plebeian stock, Bismarck was born at a time when all Prussia was eager to repel the onslaughts of Napoleon I. He attended the best gymnasiums in Germany; easily passing through the three upper classes within the short space of two years.

The potent and permanent impressions of his youth, however, were undoubtedly associated with the life of the rural nobility of North-eastern Prussia. After one term at the university, during which he displayed great diligence, Bismarck entered one of the student fraternities; but, although, by reason of his superior swordsmanship, styled "Achilles the Invulnerable," he never became thoroughly absorbed in the superficialities of student life. At this time he already exhibited a knowledge of men and a faculty for handling them; and he delighted in the study of human nature. Englishmen and Americans exercised a considerable influence over him. At this time, also, he gave evidence of that loftiness of purpose which the greatest difficulties could not appall. He even dared to contradict the assertion of Motley, that Germany could not be united.

Another decade was spent in the exercise of official duties and in agricultural pursuits; ever acquiring the confidence of his neighbors and fellow-citizens. In 1847, at the age of thirty-two, he made his entrance into the arena of public life: he entered the Landtag, and, at a stroke, the finished statesman stood revealed!

At the first and the second Landtag, in the second Kammer, and at the Erfurt Unionsparlament, Bismarck was already distinguished by the attributes of the successful speaker. Indeed, he was, in some respects, one of the most impressive orators of the century; and his speeches were models of intellectual effort. Bismarck did not greatly value rhetorical gifts, and once designated them as an inferior manifestation of intellectual life. Nor did he ever affect the style of the polished orator. He spoke to the point, was quick at repartee, and his remarks, though sharp enough at times, were never inelegant. His discourse was ever enlightened by apt illustrations and striking pictures, evidences of the man's originality and of that deep sense of humor which accompanied him through life, and even upon his death-bed did not forsake him. His speeches never suggested the musty folio or the mid-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

night lamp. And yet how varied the attainments of the man, and how extensive his reading!

Bismarck possessed a vast fund of knowledge, upon which, however, he would only occasionally draw. Although highly impressionable, he was distinguished by solidity of learning and breadth of culture. Already upon his first appearance in public life, he had revealed the fundamental principles of his political faith,—sterling patriotism, fearless courage of conviction, and a firm belief in power as the basis of political influence. His first address before the Landtag was delivered in defence of patriotism. Amid the tumult of discussion arising over the point, that the struggle of 1813 was waged to secure constitutional rights, Bismarck arose and expressed his views in the following terms:

"In my opinion, we render a poor service to national economy when we declare that the abuse and degradation inflicted upon us by the foreign invader were not sufficient to stir our blood and to subordinate all other sentiments to the hatred of the oppressor."

When the second Landtag, on April 2, 1848, submitted an address to the King in acknowledgment of the concessions granted in March, Bismarck and one other deputy refused their signatures; Bismarck declaring that he could not simulate a joy that he did not feel. Hundreds of deputies, on the other hand, and among them the most prominent and independent in the land, to whom the March proceedings had been thoroughly distasteful, acted as though perfectly satisfied with the result.

In respect of manly courage and fidelity to conviction, Bismarck has never been excelled even by the most radical revolutionist. In every popular assembly—in the Landtag, Kammer, and Unionsparlament—he invariably emphasized the idea that there could be but one policy for Germany, a policy based upon the power of Prussia. This view was well expressed in an address to the parliamentary deputation that waited upon him on the occasion of his eightieth birthday: "It has always been my aim to utilize the power of Prussia for the furtherance of the German idea." During the eight years of his activity in the Bundestag, Bismarck never deviated from this policy; and his reports and letters bear testimony to his fidelity of purpose.

Every unprejudiced observer must admire the manner in which this *Junker* and law student bore himself in the great world. What superior intelligence and fine humor were displayed in his intercourse with the men of high and low degree in the Confederation! He was never harsh in his bearing, but always firm; finding time and strength, amid his multifarious duties, to direct the European policy of his country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He visited the Court of St. Petersburg, that high-school of diplomacy, which has ever borne the reputation of giving the best qualification for foreign service; and here Bismarck attained his political maturity. In the full vigor of manhood, rich in experience and fertile of resource, he assumed the leadership of Prussian affairs, founded the Empire, and controlled its destinies during several decades, the most glorious in the history of Germany.

Of his triumphs and defeats, joys and disappointments, it is impossible as yet to speak. On March 23, 1895, the Reichstag framed an address congratulating Bismarck upon his eightieth birthday. During the debate which followed, the Chancellor's attitude toward his political adversaries was thus warmly defended by an old associate:

"A task so comprehensive, a patriotic service so long, ardent, and disinterested naturally call for passionate zeal and indomitable will; and such qualities inevitably invite antagonism."

Bismarck possessed all these qualities in a high degree: they were requisite to the success of his great undertaking, the establishment of German unity; yet they led to sharp contests in the domain of domestic affairs. Bismarck, who was never spared by his opponents, undoubtedly offended, and grievously offended, many of them; numerous interests suffered injury at his hands; and he was frequently considered too radical in his work of demolition. In his anxiety to put the great national structure under cover, he was sometimes constrained to disregard details of masonry. He was compelled to enforce compliance with his views and to bend his opponents to his will.

It is impossible to refute the assertion that Bismarck's methods of government were not conducive to the development of independent action; but these are the inevitable results of greatness in every sphere. The weak are vanquished: the light of genius remains. And this light will long serve as a beacon to guide the German people to their destiny.

With the sadness which overwhelms us in these days there is mingled a feeling of gratitude that this great man was bestowed upon us. Many vows to live and to serve the Fatherland in the spirit that he did have been made. The German people will never surrender Bismarck's gift to them; but, like him, will firmly guard their rights. If they thus follow in his footsteps, they will, like him, respect the rights and interests of others, and Germany's policy will be, as Bismarck's was, a powerful factor in the promotion of peace and of the welfare of humanity.

DIETRICH SCHÄFER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TAMMANY PAST AND PRESENT.

TAMMANY has now been in undisputed and practically unrestricted control of the affairs of the city of New York for three-quarters of a year. The existence of an independent Democratic organization in Brooklyn Borough, as well as the other boroughs, is not important. The purposes and methods of all are very much the same. Where differences have arisen, Tammany has had its way. In the boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx—the old city of New York—it is practically supreme.

What is Tammany? What, so far, since its restoration, has it done? Mr. Simon Sterne, in a valuable and discriminating article ("The Reconquest of New York by Tammany.") in THE FORUM for January last spoke of the Tammany organization as "banded together in the main for the purpose of maintaining its members directly and indirectly by public office and from the proceeds of compulsory taxation."

By this view Tammany is a corporation of limited liability engaged in politics as a business. It does not follow that all who share in its management depend on politics for their revenue; while, on the other hand, the revenue of many of its active managers, not directly derived from taxation, is largely and favorably influenced by their political power. In theory the Tammany organization is that of a representative democracy, with a logical series of bodies of delegates; the lowest being chosen by all the party voters, the next highest by the first, and so on to the leader. In practice the working of this representative system is modified by the skill and energy of individuals in controlling, and often in corrupting, the process of selection. All the party voters do not take part in the primary choice; men not of the party and not even voters are sometimes brought in; the rolls are stuffed and the count is manipulated from time to time as the exigencies of one faction require and the strength of another may permit, as in other political organizations where the spoils of victory are the chief object. The leader who comes out at the apex of this pyramidal structure, the man who, in the language of his fellows, is "on top," is thus evolved by a complex and obscure process: but essentially the process is one of representation; and, what-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever may be their motives, he must have the active support of the majority in each successive delegate body and that of the majority of the mass at the bottom who take part in politics.

For this chief the popular title, accepted by friends and opponents alike, is "The Boss." The derision often implied in the term is natural, but somewhat misdirected, and expresses a view not without risks. The title is essentially not a bad one. It comes down directly from the Dutch rulers of Manhattan Island, and implies substantial power and authority distinctly recognized. The Boss is to be reckoned with; and the man or the party that undertakes to thwart him without understanding the sources and extent of his strength is not likely to succeed. Certainly the Boss of Tammany uses his power in a manner that to outsiders seems arbitrary; but it is always very sharply limited by absolute necessity for the support of his followers. He is a leader, not a ruler: he is chosen, not imposed. Primarily the motives to which he appeals in order to get and to keep his power are partisanship and interest. They are the strongest passions of ordinary men; and the leader who can unite them and use them to control the political action of a half-million of voters and the public affairs of three millions of people must possess gifts more unusual than those of any living hereditary ruler whom, at the moment, I can recall.

Partisanship is a source of power to Tammany indirectly rather than directly. It enables it to secure the support at the polls of that great body of Democratic voters—a large majority of the party in the city—who take no share in the organization. This support is given to Tammany candidates because they are regular. It varies with the character of the candidates and the state of the public mind. From time to time it fails, and Tammany is cast out until it can again secure enough of the purely partisan vote to give it a plurality.

The chief motive power of the machine proper, from the voters at the primaries to the leaders, is interest. By this is not meant the greed of money alone. It includes ambition of a not discreditable sort, vanity, social aspirations no less real and effectual because incomprehensible to those who think that they constitute the only "society," and the love of distinction, which, it must be remembered, is measured by the distance from the next lower, not the next higher, rank. At the very bottom, in the bed-rock stratum on which Tammany rests, in the voters and workers at the primaries, interest takes many forms, some grotesque, some pitiful, some criminal; but it is general and intense. First, last, and all the time the business of every active manager in Tammany, of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whatever rank, is to attach to himself and to the machine, by actual, tangible service of real value to the recipients, as many men as he can. For this he must expend time and effort and influence and money without stint. His own purpose may be selfish. He may be crafty, deceitful, unscrupulous, greedy, a swindler, a thief, a perjurer: but service he must render, at all times, in a thousand ways, to as many men as may be; and it must be substantial service which they recognize and are willing to repay.

The chief field of this activity, in which the greatest number of voters are influenced, is the distribution of employment to unskilled laborers or the lower grade of mechanics, either directly under the various departments or under contractors for the city or under corporations more or less dependent for privileges upon the action of political officials. Beyond those reached in this way is a considerable multitude enlisted by gifts of small amount, but numerous and timely,—a few dollars for rent or provisions or fuel, tiding over a period of no work, or sickness, or other distress. Back of these, and constituting an energetie and efficient force, are those protected from the just, and sometimes, but rarely, from the unjust, enforcement of the law. In very many instances these offenders are victims of drink, members of the working-classes, not habitually lawless, to whom an occasional sentence of "ten dollars or ten days" involves great distress for their families, and who are bound with hooks of steel to the politician who secures the remission or the payment of the fine. Many of them, however, are vicious and incorrigible members of the distinctly criminal classes. The kind of service they claim from the politicians, and that which they return, constitute a real danger to society and to all classes of society.

The basis of the power of Tammany is the hold its active managers have upon the very large numbers of the poorer classes through services rendered. How strong this hold is is indicated in the following extract from a report in the "New York Times" of August 15, 1898, of an address made by the Rev. Herbert Casson to the Labor Church, of Lynn, Massachusetts, on the previous day, referring to Mr. Theodore Roosevelt:

"He has no sympathy for the poor; he has but hatred for them. He forever fights Croker and Tammany in New York, but, bad as it is, Tammany is a better friend to the poor than twenty brigades of Roosevelts would be. A spectacular chap, Roosevelt appeals to the masses by grand-stand plays about good government.

Tammany appeals to the masses by providing rent and food. Tammany may be corrupt; but better a corrupt crowd that feeds the toiler food than a bigot who with high-sounding phrases tries to deprive them of an opportunity of enjoying

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their one day of rest, and destroys their homes by driving into the residential districts the painted lilies of the streets."

This is a view of Tammany sincerely held by many honest men; and it has for foundation the facts I have briefly described. I think it is a fair inference that the power of Tammany for evil cannot be destroyed, and that the affairs of the city cannot be placed in honest and able hands, until those who hold this view see their error, see that for the great mass of "the poor" the rule of Tammany is maintained at a cost far outweighing the aid it extends for selfish purposes to individuals. It is with reference to the effect of Tammany rule since January 1 of this year upon the poorer classes that I propose to examine its record.

I may say at the outset that the record discloses neither instances of gross extravagance nor of scandalous jobbery such as have occurred in the city government in the past, or in the State government within the last few years. The financial management of the city has not been able or skilful. It has, indeed, been muddled; and the wabbling of the Law Department over the very important question of the debt limit, as affecting the validity of new issues of city bonds was, to say the least, most peculiar. But there has been a stringent effort to keep down total expenditures. Some good work has been deferred or starved in order that some departments might yield a richer return of patronage; but a showing of economy in net results has been sought, and on the whole fairly obtained. From the ordinary force in the various departments the city is getting less service and poorer for the money expended, while in special departments like those of the police and of street cleaning there is a conspicuous falling off; but the money cost of running the city is not sensibly affected. Again, in the matter of public schools, which most intimately concerns the greatest number of the people of the city, there has been no material change; the administration of the schools remaining practically in the same hands, Tammany has no chance either to repeat or avoid the evils which unquestionably existed and were very serious when it was last in power.

I regard the good administration of the civil service of the city in all its grades, that is to say, the selection and control of the vast army of city appointees and employees, as of the most immediate and vital concern to the people. This concern is important in inverse ratio to the means of the taxpayers. Every resident is a taxpayer, directly or indirectly, who is able to provide himself with shelter and food; and the burden of the tax is heavier in proportion as the provision is more difficult. The rights of what, for want of a better term, I may call the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poorer classes, as to the administration of the civil service are two-fold. In the first place, as contributors to the treasury it is their clear right that every dollar expended shall secure the best service, and therefore the best servants obtainable from the highest rank to the lowest. This right is the more sacred because the contributions of most of these classes are unconscious, are made without distinct knowledge by the contributors. The taxes paid in rent and in the prices affected by rent are a trust fund in the treasury which it is a shame to divert or waste. In the second place it is a peculiarly clear right of the poor, to whom the chance to work is the chance to live and to provide a living for their families, that employment by the city in such labor as they are able to do shall be open to them without prejudice or discrimination. The day laborer, or his son who has made a good use of the priceless opportunities of the public schools, seeking employment from the city is cheated, outraged, and humiliated when his success is made to depend on the favor of a politician. The offence to him and to society is still more shameful and vicious when the price of this favor is party service or personal service to the politician.

Both of these rights are openly violated by Tammany Hall. The violation of them is the basis of the whole Tammany system; and if these rights were understood and insisted on by the poorer classes, its fabric would inevitably go to pieces. Since the return of Tammany to power it has made substantial progress in undermining the system by which for fourteen years these rights had been more or less effectually protected, and which would protect at least the second of them almost completely, if honestly and intelligently administered. To speak first of the general practice as to securing the best possible service. It has been defiantly bad. Take two conspicuous instances. Tammany found at the head of the Street-Cleaning Department Col. George E. Waring. As an organizer and executive officer, he had no superior in the United States. For scientific knowledge of the work in which he was engaged, his reputation extended far beyond our country. His honesty was not only impregnable, but aggressive. These qualifications and others equally high he had proved. His work was so unprecedentedly good that it was a revelation. It advanced in thoroughness and skill from the day he took it in hand. His moulding of the street-cleaning force, mainly from the old apparently hopeless material, into a body of self-respecting, ambitious, and efficient public servants, with a *morale* and an *esprit de corps* akin to that of our peerless navy, was a veritable marvel. Within its ranks he had practically solved the problem of labor disputes; for,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by referring every case for investigation and discussion to committees composed of freely chosen representatives of the employees and of representatives of the Commissioner, he made the force in effect self-disciplining. His usefulness in his department was continually increasing; many of the improvements he devised requiring time. Col. Waring was not a partisan, not even in his political preferences a Republican; and many of his subordinates, some in places of importance, remained, without question from him, members of Tammany Hall. He simply excluded all consideration of politics from his department.

When Tammany came into power Col. Waring was replaced by an appointee of very moderate ability whose one claim to favor was that he would not exclude politics from the Department, but would admit and recognize it. The result is a distinct deterioration instead of the progress that we should have had. The standard of efficiency is still much higher than of old; but it is lower than it was under Col. Waring. The "pull" has been reëstablished, not in its former stupid tyranny, but in a degree that shows; and this gives to the politicians the chance for their undemocratic, unjust, and fraudulent privilege.

The second case is like the first. The Engineer-in-Chief of the Dock Department on January 1 was Mr. George S. Greene, Jr. He had performed the duties of the office for some twenty-four years. The dock system was largely his creation. In building it up he had overcome certain grave engineering difficulties with skill and originality that amounted to genius; and his preëminence was recognized at home and abroad. During the previous two years the Department had obtained authority and means largely to extend the docks according to a plan which Mr. Greene had worked out and gradually prepared for a score of years. It was chiefly due to his intelligence, vigilance, and foresight that the revenues and expenditures of the Department had been maintained in equilibrium, and that the steadily expanding needs of the vast commerce of the port had been met without expense to the city treasury. As an executive officer his methods were of the highest, marked by the strict and impartial discipline of the army and by the adaptability and efficiency of a great industrial establishment. His devotion to his work was absolute, his pride in it great: the ability he had applied to it would have won for him in his profession many times the modest salary he had received. With the advent of Tammany he was "discharged" promptly and brutally for the sole reason that, so far as lay in his power, he had always stubbornly resisted the sacrifice of the interests of the city to the need or the greed of any party or its leaders. He, also, was no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partisan, and even had, out of consideration for a Tammany commissioner who had protected the Department from the destructive influence of the Boss, made payments from time to time to Mr. Croker,—an utterly mistaken course, perhaps, but throwing light on the sense of decency of that gentleman. Mr. Greene's successor, so far as I can discover, leaves unopposed and uncriticised the use of the appointing power in the Department for the profit and at the dictation of Tammany. Here also the "pull" has been reëstablished, so that the privilege of the politician outweighs the right of the citizen.

Throughout the municipal service generally, in cases where vacancies cannot conveniently be filled arbitrarily, officers and employees of every grade who are not in favor with Tammany, and especially those whose standard of duty interferes with the plans of Tammany, have had their salaries reduced. In some departments these reductions are generally recognized as the fines imposed for undue vigilance and zeal. The effect upon the value of the service the taxpayers get for their money is plain.

If we turn now to the specific system established by law, intended to secure the best service for the city and also to guarantee the equality of right in all citizens as to employment in the service, we shall find the policy of Tammany steadily subversive. By the amazing enactment, popularly known as the Charter of Greater New York, the system regulating the civil service of the city was exempted from the effective supervision of the State Commission, and the rules adopted by the City Commission and the Mayor no longer required the approval of the State Commission. This was obviously opposed to the effective enforcement of the fundamental law of the State, which made merit and fitness, tested as far as practicable by competitive examination, a principle of State legislation. Incidentally it was a political blunder.

A law was passed on March 31 last to amend this provision of the Charter: but it has been declared ineffective by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court; and until this decision shall have been reversed by the Court of Appeals, or the defect remedied by legislation, the Mayor and the City Commission have complete control of the city rules within the general and somewhat vague provisions of the law. The City Commission has, accordingly, made radical changes in the rules. They are mostly in the direction of exemption of appointments from the impartial test of open competition, and tend to enlarge the arbitrary discretion of the appointing officers, with corresponding opportunity for abuse. A large number of exceptions from examination has been made; and, by an ingenious change, these may be applied to an indefinite num-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber of persons. Under the old rules twenty-one offices were excepted by title, and only one appointment could be made to each of these, save by special provision. Under the new rules the offices excepted by title from examination are seventy-eight, and the limitation of the number of appointments under each title is quietly omitted. A quite unlimited range of appointments is thus placed, without examination, at the disposal of the politicians. In the schedules still nominally competitive the opportunity for temporary appointments without examination has been greatly increased.

Again, the range of selection has been much broadened by the repeal of the restriction as to the number of names submitted for choice on requisition and by giving the appointing officer greater liberty of rejection. Transfers from non-competitive to competitive positions are allowed after one year's service instead of five years'. The practice of assigning persons employed as laborers, without examination, to the duties of offices properly to be filled only after examination has been considerably extended. It will be seen that under these changes an aspirant for city employment, possessing the indispensable favor of Tammany, but indisposed or unable to meet the practical test of examinations, may be taken on as a laborer and assigned to clerical or other like work, may receive a "temporary" appointment with a chance of practically indefinite renewal, may get a place on a "pass" examination and be transferred to one which should have been filled by competition, or may be one of an indefinite number of appointees to places exempted from examination. In every one of these devices the constitutional provision for securing the best service for the public, and equal right to all for a chance to enter the service, is evaded. In every case the constitutional test of open competition has been shown by actual experience to be entirely practicable. The effect is to defeat the purpose of the constitution and to violate the plain public rights placed under constitutional protection; and that undoubtedly was the intent of Tammany.

Under the civil service statute of New York, there had been established in this city a set of rules governing the appointment of laborers. They were simple and effective, and practically abolished the odious influence of the politicians in this direction by the application of the principle "first come, first served." Applicants for employment, passing a proper physical examination, had their names registered, and were certified for employment in the order of their registration,—the earliest first, and so on. Firmly and honestly enforced, these rules were a substantial protection of the clear right of the laboring-classes to such work

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as they could fairly do, with no dependence on the favor, always humiliating and often corrupting, of the politicians. This protection has been withdrawn. The requirement, that names shall be certified in the order of the time of registration, has been omitted from the new rules. Selection may be made from any names on the list; and nothing but zeal and industry on the part of the district leaders is now needed to make this practically an enrolment of their dependents. To my mind, no more shameful outrage upon "the poor," nothing more revolting to real democracy, could be imagined.

The Lexow Committee's investigation of the Police Department established beyond any reasonable doubt two facts; viz., (1) that promotion through the various grades was secured by a combination of political influence and bribery; and (2) that the enforcement or non-enforcement of the laws was a source of revenue, often very large, to the officers of the police force. The investigation was neither thorough nor impartial, and in many of its features was blameworthy. It was at the outset inspired more by the hope of partisan advantage than by an unselfish purpose to expose wrong and promote right. Its chairman was not entitled, either by character, ability, or experience, to that implicit confidence which a man in his position should have commanded. Much of the work of detection and disclosure was done by the unofficial agents of a volunteer organization, excellent in purpose, but lacking in judgment, experience, and responsibility. The lawyer employed actively to conduct and direct the investigation was a man of great ability and unbounded energy and persistence, but of some fixed prejudices and of erratic temperament, who rode rough-shod over many of the conventions of his profession and who discredited some of the testimony, in itself very convincing, by the vigor and even violence with which he extorted it. Despite these drawbacks, the net result of the investigation was the general and just conviction in the public mind that the two facts mentioned above were firmly established. It is extremely significant that this conviction was most deeply rooted in the classes to whom the guilty, the takers and givers of bribes, belonged. Professional and business men, accustomed to weigh evidence and sift it and to deal with fairly honest witnesses, may have been inclined to suspend judgment in some cases, while impressed by the general vileness disclosed. But the men who sold and the men and women who bought license to break the law knew that their vile traffic had been exposed to the light, and made their plans accordingly. They and all whom they could influence directly or indirectly were, after Mayor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Strong's election, organized into an anti-reform movement, working night and day with all their might for the restoration of the old *régime.* The half-drunken women of the town, whom many of us saw in certain streets of New York on last Election Night cheering for Tammany and invoking the blessing of their God on Van Wyck,—it is significant that the personality of the Mayor-elect counted so little that they frequently pronounced his name "Van Wik,"—were types of a very numerous class who looked on the return of Tammany as their peculiar triumph, securing their emancipation from the restrictions of the law.

They have not been disappointed. The traffic in license, so far as one can judge by known facts, has been revived. By an unwarranted evasion, if not open violation, of the statute, the Police Commission has been changed. The Chief of Police, with whom the Commissioners had declared themselves entirely satisfied, has been retired; and his place has been filled by one of the old captains who had actually been dismissed by the old Board, after the Lexow investigation, as a sacrifice to public indignation. While it is obviously impossible to prove specific transactions in the old line of business at this stage of its development, it is extremely difficult to doubt its reëstablishment, if one is at all acquainted with the "daily walk and conversation" of those formerly engaged in it. These make no question that the rule of the police is again becoming *facio ut des,* and that of the gamblers, the keepers of houses of ill-fame, the violators of the excise law, etc., *do ut facias.* When the arm of the law is thus moved or stayed by money, the resulting corruption is at once insidious and shameless. There is no crime known to the code more outrageous than trade in crime.

Official evidence of a general nature is not wanting, as when the Magistrate of the Harlem Police Court refused to hold two saloon-keepers on complaint of a policeman; declaring that there were thousands daily violating the law, and he saw no reason why these should be selected for punishment when others were left free.

The value of various precincts is being quoted among the police and the politicians. One, whence a transfer has recently been ordered, is estimated at $16,000 a year, on the basis of a monthly contribution of $10 from each privileged dealer. In the down-town East-Side region, and in that peculiar quarter the richness of which in police revenue gave it the name of "The Tenderloin," values are quoted still higher, and are based on a more revolting class of privileges.

In the tenement-house districts where the enforcement of the sanitary laws is at once most necessary and difficult, police business takes a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

somewhat different form, and exemptions from undue annoyance are arranged with that industrious and influential person, the district leader.

In all these matters, and in promotions and other advantages in the police force, the influence of the old combination of money and "pull" is generally recognized.

The return of Tammany has not been disappointing to its leaders or to its opponents. It has begun again, with greater skill, but with no less energy and resolution, to do the kind of work in which it was formerly engaged. This was inevitable; for the use and abuse of official power to get money must always be not merely the chief object, but the primary condition of its existence.

I have tried to show as well as I could in the limits of such an article as this, that the basis of the power of the Tammany organization is the hold it has on large numbers of the poorer classes. To these classes as a whole it is, nevertheless, always and entirely an evil. It robs and cheats them at every turn. It makes heavier the already sore burdens that they must bear. It increases the cost of the living which at best is so hard to get. It tends to make health more difficult and deaths more frequent. It levies toll on their contributions to the public treasury, and denies them their fair share of the public employment. In the enforcement of the laws in which they are most deeply interested justice, order, and decency have no place. In quarters where the poorer classes are compelled to dwell it pollutes, by the sale of license for the grossest immorality, the surroundings in which their children must be reared.

One condition, as I have said, of the rescue of the city from Tammany is to loosen the hold of Tammany on these classes and to convince them of the real and serious mischief done to them. There is, however, another not less imperative. Tammany maintains its organization by the means I have described; but its strength at the polls depends largely on the support its organization gets from Democrats because of its regularity. When intelligent Democrats, with no selfish interest in Tammany, will ask themselves what is their personal duty to the city, and will do that duty, the reign of Tammany, powerful and "tough" beyond all precedent as Tammany has shown itself to be, will surely end.

EDWARD CARY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A DECADE OF MAGAZINE LITERATURE.—1888–1897.

TEN years ago a friend, interested in my intellectual growth, and desirous of furnishing me with material for professional use, began sending me, as an annual Christmas gift, five of the leading American and English magazines. They were THE FORUM, "The North American Review," "The Nineteenth Century," "The Contemporary Review," and "The Fortnightly Review." During a decade these magazines have come each month with the latest word on all the great questions of the day, until they have created a storehouse of contemporaneous literature available for immediate use. They form far more than a collection of fugitive sketches by skilful hacks: they make a library of permanent value, in which are represented the ablest thinkers and statesmen, the wisest scholars and scientists, the subtlest critics and philosophers. He who has read this library has come into touch with some of the finest spirits of his time. Many of the works which have become permanent authorities in science, religion, politics, education, and statecraft have been first printed in the magazines.

The monthly reviews have most of the advantages and few of the disadvantages of the daily press. Like the newspapers, they must furnish articles which have value in themselves; and the articles must be timely. They must be written, too, by men or women who can command attention. But the newspaper is ephemeral. Its collection of facts and its editorial discussions are hurried and haphazard. What else can be expected when the history of the world for a day is to be written in a day, and its philosophy and practice distilled? It is not so with the review. It does not cater to the lower order of intelligence: its public is select. Its work may be laid out for a year in advance; its contributors may be selected with the greatest care, and in many cases they have time to do their work after research and deliberation; while every new genius brings his offerings to the judgment-seat of the editor, that he may obtain an audience for his cherished offspring.

In the reviews one may feel the pulse of society, follow the movements of the people, enter into the inner policies of prime ministers,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

study the course of Spain in the Philippines; of Russia and England in China; of England, France, and Germany in Africa. One may catch the spirit of ancient and modern art, and observe the birth and growth of great economic and religious institutions. He who would be equipped for a life of thought, for the discussion of the great problems of nature and humanity as viewed by experts, must keep himself informed in magazine literature.

The clergyman will find the magazines of more value than his denominational paper; since in this larger forum appear not merely the members of his own theological party, but men of all parties, and the discussions are carried on by the ablest disputants and in a truly catholic spirit. The politician must listen and ponder when his opponent, far from heated caucus, addresses him in the quiet of his library and in the calm utterances of the reviews. For the scientist and the financier the review becomes a well-regulated clearing-house, in which obligations are recognized and adjusted.

The general impression received from a decade of magazine literature, in the broadening of one's intellectual horizon, the enriching of memory and imagination, and the growth of human sympathy and companionship, has been so significant, that I have thought it worth the while to analyze more carefully its contribution to the intellectual life of our time. In view of the extent of the work, I have selected two reviews of the first class, whose circulation and general character entitle them to be called representative—THE FORUM and "The Nineteenth Century." Whatever we learn by an examination of these magazines we may conclude is approximately true of others of the same kind.

My first step in this analysis has been to make the table which is printed on the following page. While this has been done with considerable difficulty and hesitation, I think it classifies with sufficient accuracy the articles published in the two reviews during the period under consideration.

An analysis of the table discloses: (1) *General World-Tendencies.* There can be no doubt that the great movements of the present age are economic and political. All our ideals and ways of life are becoming commercialized. The rise and growth of democracy, which have characterized the present century, have reached their climax toward its end. The last decade has been largely occupied in the discussion of the rights of working-men, scales of wages, and the length of the working-day. Men have studied, as never before, the laws which underlie the production and distribution of wealth, the nature of money, and the methods

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Classification of Articles in "The Forum" and "The Nineteenth Century" during the Decade 1888–1897.

	Science.		Religion.		Political Economy.		History.		Fiction.		Education.		Politics.		Philosophy.		Poetry.		Miscellaneous.		Totals.	
	F.	N. C.	F.	N. C.	F.	N. C.	F.	N. C.	F.	N. C.	F.	N. C.	F.	N. C.	F.	N. C.	F.	N. C.	F.	N. C.	F.	N. C.
1888	6	7	6	9	33	21	5	5	4	1	25	10	26	27	..	2	..	4	29	47	131	133
1889	7	9	8	18	30	18	4	11	3	..	12	3	33	36	..	..	3	3	28	43	130	142
1890	15	14	10	9	32	26	2	12	3	..	3	..	35	31	..	..	..	1	25	48	125	141
1891	8	13	7	18	38	27	6	15	2	..	5	3	32	16	..	1	..	6	40	60	138	158
1892	2	16	6	4	60	31	2	8	1	..	5	3	33	41	..	..	3	13	45	82	155	198
1893	8	11	8	18	45	22	4	17	6	3	11	5	32	23	..	..	..	6	32	55	149	160
1894	6	7	14	16	49	24	6	10	3	1	7	5	30	26	1	2	..	..	27	84	143	175
1895	2	7	6	23	50	17	10	15	7	..	14	5	13	35	..	5	..	1	41	68	143	176
1896	4	9	8	13	24	24	6	18	4	2	11	14	38	36	..	2	..	1	40	65	135	184
1897	3	9	5	11	40	21	13	21	1	2	10	6	31	42	..	2	6	2	25	57	134	173
Totals	61	102	78	139	401	231	58	132	34	9	103	54	303	313	1	14	12	37	332	609	1,383	1,640

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of taxation. There has been much social restlessness: the appearances of the revolutionist and the anarchist have been more frequent and threatening. The two reviews in question have registered these conditions. "The Nineteenth Century" has given 231 articles, by the ablest thinkers and writers, on different phases of political economy and sociology. THE FORUM has printed 401. Together, out of a total of 3,023 articles the two magazines have given 632 on these subjects—nearly one-fifth of the entire matter published. The larger number given by THE FORUM is due to the fact that the supreme problems with us to-day are economic. They are as acute as the subject of slavery in the early sixties.

Politics in England and America has been largely the management of a nascent democracy. Great world-movements find their best illustrations in England and America. There were 313 articles on politics in "The Nineteenth Century," and 303 in THE FORUM; a total of 616, or 16 less than on economics. Economics and politics together number 1,248—less than one-half of the whole number.

Science is well represented; 102 articles having appeared in "The Nineteenth Century," and 61 in THE FORUM—a total of 163, or about one-nineteenth of the entire number. Religion has 139 in "The Nineteenth Century," and 78 in THE FORUM—a total of 217, or about one-fourteenth of the whole. Science and religion together number 380 articles, nearly one-eighth of the whole. These figures fairly represent the interest taken by the public in discussions of science and religion, as compared with those of economics and politics. In America, where suffrage is universal, and the public school is so important an institution, education commands large attention. During the ten years THE FORUM has had 103 articles, and "The Nineteenth Century" 54; 157 in all, or about one-nineteenth of the whole.

The table indicates the somewhat narrow interest in philosophy and poetry, both in England and America; although it must be said that, philosophy having its special organs, the showing is not quite accurate. "The Nineteenth Century" had 14 articles on philosophy, and on poetry 37; THE FORUM, philosophy 1; poetry 12. Philosophy and poetry combined make but one-forty-seventh of the whole.

History is represented in "The Nineteenth Century" by 132 articles, in THE FORUM by 58; 190 in all, or a little less than one-sixteenth of the entire number. There are 34 articles on fiction in THE FORUM, and 9 in "The Nineteenth Century"; 43 in all, or about one-seventieth of the whole. Those classified as "Miscellaneous" number in "The Nineteenth Century" 609, in THE FORUM 332; a total of 941, or about one-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

third of the whole. These articles, dealing with nearly every imaginable subject, suggest the almost infinite variety of the interests of modern life.

The table also shows: (2) *Points of Agreement and Contrast between American and English Thought.* The points of agreement are many; those of contrast, few and superficial. Nothing, perhaps, will show with more distinctness the essential unity of the English race than an examination of the matter and method of the literature of a decade. The demand of the public and of the world of authorship is, "What are Englishmen and Americans thinking about?" "What ideals and motives are supreme in Great Britain and the United States?" If there is to be an alliance of England and America, its sure ground will be not military, but intellectual. If the two nations are thinking the same thoughts, admiring the same personalities, and cherishing the same imaginings, their union is certain. That Englishmen and Americans are at heart one, that they are meeting and solving the same political, social, and religious problems, is evident in the unconscious revelation of ten years' writing for the registers and framers of public opinion—the great reviews.

It will be observed, as I have already pointed out, that both the English and the American reviews have a large number of articles on politics. "The Nineteenth Century" has 313, THE FORUM 303—a total of 616. But the largest number of articles on any one subject is 632 on political economy. Of this number, 401 are in THE FORUM, and 231 in "The Nineteenth Century." There can be no doubt that economic questions in our country, where industrial difficulties have been more pronounced, are more insistent than in England, where various adjustments have been brought about which we have not accomplished. The next largest number in THE FORUM is on education, 103; "The Nineteenth Century" having 54. Religion has the third place, THE FORUM giving 78 articles. But the English people, who are said to be readers of sermons, are also readers of articles on religion; and "The Nineteenth Century" gives 139. The American magazine publishes 61 articles on science; the English magazine, 102. THE FORUM prints 58 on history; "The Nineteenth Century," 132. England is writing history: America is making it. America, it would seem, takes more interest in the novel, since THE FORUM has 34 on fiction; while "The Nineteenth Century" has but 9. England, on the other hand, appears to show a greater interest in philosophy and poetry; her representative furnishing 14 articles on the former subject and 37 on the latter. The American representative has 1 on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

philosophy, and 12 on poetry. Greater variety is indicated by "The Nineteenth Century" in miscellaneous subjects, with 609 articles out of 1,640; THE FORUM'S figures being 332 out of 1,383. But THE FORUM shows greater brevity.

(3) *The Character of Articles.* I had thought that a decade would show changes in contributions, corresponding to the assumed alterations in public feeling and life. It is possible that the period examined is too short a one to secure definite results, or it may be that the prevailing problems of society and life have not altered. It would be interesting to study the formative period in our national history in the magazines, corresponding to our modern ones, if only they existed. The coming historian will find an inexhaustible storehouse of material in the magazines of to-day. To follow the growth of Abolitionism, or to study Reconstruction and the education of the freeman, or to investigate the growth of democracy since the passage of the Reform Bill in 1832, is to feel the throb of the great human heart. No such changes are visible in the ten years just closed. But it will be observed that the table indicates a deepening of the popular interest in political economy and politics. In other respects, so far as the articles published indicate, the world has proceeded on an even course.

It is sometimes said, that, as the century draws to a close, Science, which achieved its great triumph in the "Origin of Species" in 1858, is declining, and that Religion is reassuming her rightful place as the superior mistress of men's minds and lives. But there is nothing in the table before us to show that this is the case. The number and interest of the articles remain about the same for the decade. We have reason, however, to believe that true science and true religion, as they enlarge their borders, grow at once broader and more humble; mutually approaching one another. Higher views of industrial relations, of education, of political rights and duties, are gaining ground as humanity approaches its coronation. When that shall come, the world will acknowledge as among its chief benefactors, defenders, and inspirers, the reviews and their discriminating and hopeful editors.

CHARLES HENRY EATON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRAMPS AND HOBOES.

My attention was arrested by the article entitled "The Tramp Problem: a Remedy," by Mr. Henry E. Rood, in The Forum for March, 1898, p. 90. Having been a tramp myself (with no literary or sociological motive, however); having been much in company with tramps[1]; having revelled with them and suffered with them on trains, on foot, in barns, under shelter of haystacks, beneath the stars of heaven, in lock-ups, and in city parks, I know whereof I speak. I venture, therefore, to offer some corrections of the impressions under which the author of the article referred to labors, to so great a disadvantage to himself, his readers, and the "gentlemen of the road."

In the first place, Mr. Rood fails to make distinctions where great differences exist. He takes no account of the tramp caste,—a condition that is essential. For, as there are castes of lawyers, physicians, ministers, and tradesmen, so there is a caste of tramps. Tramping is in no inconsiderable sense a profession, a human pursuit. If there is a Tramp Problem, there is also a Preacher Problem, and a Lawyer Problem; for do we not read in the papers that there is an over-supply of preachers, that the competition of clergymen threatens to create disrespect of the Church, and that lawyers have so multiplied that, instead of being benefactors to the State, they are a menace, making laws for their own gain?

If all preachers were worthy and all lawyers sincere, there would be no Preacher Problem and no Lawyer Problem. It is the lower caste—the baser sort of preachers and lawyers—that makes the problems. Just so is it with tramps. The genuine tramp bears the world no ill-will. He has chosen his pursuit, and proposes to follow it. He *asks* for a meal, but never *demands*; for he knows quite well that if one good housewife fail him, another will not. But the criminal on the road temporarily, the vagrant driven out of the city, and their like, make the Tramp Problem serious. The genuine tramp is harmless. But for the vagrants, professional criminals, burglars, etc., who are con-

[1] I use the term "tramps" here in the general sense; reserving a differentiation of it for a subsequent paragraph.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sidered with tramps, the problem would not be serious enough to excite interest. The world does not bother about idle men: it becomes concerned when it hears of dangerous men. But to the definition of terms.

A tramp is not a hobo; a hobo is not a tramp; a vagrant is neither; a criminal is none of these. But Mr. Rood freely confuses them all. In his first paragraph he speaks of a laborer who became a professional beggar. Now if this laborer took to the road as a professional beggar, refusing absolutely to work, he became a tramp. A tramp is a man of such mental make-up that he has no higher aim than to exist and have "a little fun" occasionally; avoiding responsibility and restraint and all manner of mental concentration. He will walk only when he cannot ride, and will work himself tired going from house to house rather than accept a job on the promise of a meal. If Mr. Rood's laborer had some sort of trade at which he could work, but for some cause or other became discouraged, and, perceiving that he could live without constant working, took to the road and brought his trade into use when necessity pressed, he was a hobo.

The term "hobo" was not originally of evil significance. It originated in the West, when the great tide of humanity swept in that direction; and it was applied to the many who, failing of their first hopes, were forced to the necessity of tramping from community to community in quest of employment. A hobo is a better sort of man than a tramp, has more self-respect, is usually young, and may, I believe, be called a tramp in the first stage. Many hoboes are merely men out of work who were forced to the road by circumstances which they could not control.

A vagrant loafs around a town as long as he can. He does not jump trains,—he lacks the spirit to do that,—but he may sneak into a box-car. He is often a "grafter," that is, he blisters his arm, pretends to be paralyzed, sells pencils, tells pitiful tales of former brilliant prospects, or what not; and, very likely, has the whiskey or opium habit. Hoboes are never "grafters," though they may or may not have the habits just mentioned. Very few genuine tramps resort to the grafting scheme.

I need not define the term "criminal," though Mr. Rood uses it so freely in his article that distinctions must necessarily be made. A few criminals tramp; but neither tramps nor hoboes are criminals. A vagrant may be led by a stronger personality to almost anything.

With these definitions and distinctions in mind, let us examine Mr. Rood's article.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The young man who, he informs us, accosted a well-known business man, and, by the latter's extreme carelessness, got a two-dollar breakfast, was one of a higher class of dead-beats,—a vagrant of the city, above the average vagrant, but by no means essentially either a tramp or a hobo. A tramp would not accost a prominent business man on Broadway. He would probably go to the door of a residence on a more or less unfrequented street. A hobo might be very hungry; but his first impulse would be to beg for a dime in or about a saloon. Only as a last resort would he accost a business man on Broadway. I dare say the young man in question had been reared in New York city. At any rate, any well-known business man ought to have known better than to turn loose in a well-stocked restaurant a "strong and hearty," and presumably very hungry, young man and expect to get off with less than the price of a square meal.

I do not wish to dilate in this article on street-beggars,—the maimed, the halt, the blind, the Italian woman with her professional starvation and her professional famishing infant, etc.;—but I cannot avoid mentioning that the assumption, that "every sensible person knows that the vast majority of beggars on the streets are idle, lazy vagabonds and quasi-criminals," is a great factor in the making of just these classes of people. If a young man, who gets into a bad way, loses his job, and goes forth despairing into the streets to beg, though the humiliation burn him to the soul, be taken by every sensible person for an idle, lazy vagabond and quasi-criminal, he will speedily become one. It is easy at best to roll down-hill; and, when every sensible person kicks you, it requires a lion's heart and a hero's faith to keep from going to the dogs at a tremendous rate. The fatal mistake of our time is the failure of otherwise sensible people to act upon the principle, that all men are brothers and may become brotherly.

It is not for alms for the unfortunate that I plead: you may give a man a dime and a kick, and damn him to deeper degradation. But give him food, a word of cheer, a chance,—in the name of God, a chance—and you begin to save him. Let it be his fault if he remains a tramp. The fact that he begs for food without offering recompense does not argue necessarily that he is lazy. It may indicate that he is suffering intensely from hunger, or that the offer of his services has been so constantly met with contempt or suspicion that he has not the courage to offer them again; or it may indicate that he has worked and realized, as have many others, that in work there is only food and clothing and slavery, and that in tramping there is food, such clothing as is needed,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and no slavery. Which would you choose, assuming that you had never had such occupation as gives the higher "joy of the working"—work that creates something, work that leads to hope and ambition? "Coxey's Army" was made up of men who had found nothing in work but food, clothing, and slavery. In the spectacular march to Washington there was food, clothing, fame of a certain sort, excitement, a possible dream of spoils, and, at any rate, freedom. The man of high moral sense may prefer to be a slave; but there are many whose moral sense cannot soar so high. In some kinds of work there is something lacking; it may be variety, it may be hope, it may be freedom: in tramping, men find variety, they exchange hope for unconcern, and they are free.

Hoboes are products of industrial conditions and of the attitude of society toward unfortunate able-bodied men. It would be interesting to inquire how many hoboes have drifted into our regular army and made good soldiers, and how many responded to the President's call for volunteers. Tramps are tramps by natural bent, seconded by early training. You seldom find an old hobo: there are many old tramps. A hobo will not become a tramp if he can help it. The sad truth is that he can hardly help it in the present state of the minds of Mr. Rood's sensible people. You can hardly save a tramp: he is too far gone. Let him alone and save the hoboes, and the Tramp Problem will be, to a large extent, solved. Most of the 100,000 men on the road to-day are hoboes. They can be saved. But, before going into the remedy, suffer me to advert again to Mr. Rood's remarks.

Mr. Rood fears that tramps may become professional criminals. Never. The hobo may, but only as a last resort. The genuine tramp prefers the even tenor of his heedless way. Besides, if one should become criminal in his bent, he would most likely be detected before he became a professional. Just here let me say that a burglar does *not* "drop from one freight train" with chloroform in his pocket, jimmy in one hand and pistol in the other, and a knowledge of the neighborhood in his head, spot a particular house in the first hour, learn the habits of its occupants in the second, break into the house and murder the family in the third, and carry off his booty "on the next" freight train, as Mr. Rood appears to believe. Burglars ride in express trains. A remedy for tramps will not rid a town of burglars; nor will a remedy for burglars apply safely to tramps.

I did not set out with the purpose of proposing a remedy. I have mentioned the widely different species of the genus generally known as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tramp, to show that there must be different remedies. Let me, however, offer some suggestions.

The Rahway plan, even if it were possible of enforcement, would only serve to drive the tramps into country places or into the greater cities. It would be utterly inadequate, save for the riddance of the more or less native vagrants.

Mr. Rood's plan of starvation will not work. There are too many kind-hearted people in the world for that. There are some who, rather foolishly indeed, fear harm if they refuse to give food to strangers. And there are too many people who, having wandering sons or brothers, have, therefore, soft spots in their hearts for other wanderers. There are too many whose religion—whether right or wrong, I do not say—binds them to help tramps of all kinds.

I would advise that the genuine tramp be given up as a hopeless subject; that he be regarded as harmless at worst; that he be helped or turned away according to the impulse of those to whom he applies. I see no necessity for measures for driving him from a town, for the simple reason that he will leave soon enough without them. If disorderly, he will of course be arrested and sentenced to work at hard labor, or be expelled from the town.

The hobo may be saved. He is young; he can work; he is inclined to work. He simply lacks a brother. If the individual or community will give him an opportunity, there are ten chances to one that the world will gain a man. If he be under age, he may be put into a reformatory. At any rate, the individual and the community ought to treat him kindly, and, if possible, find for him work to which he is adapted. No young man should be turned away hopeless from the face of his brothers.

E. Lamar Bailey.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATING.

For many persons, nothing has a greater attraction than the various forms of intercollegiate contests. In the fall term, foot-ball is in vogue; during the winter, there are track athletics; and the college year is closed with base-ball and rowing. Among the conflicts, the great debates between rival colleges occupy a unique position; for they are virtually the only contests in which are exhibited to the public not physical power and endurance, but intellectual skill and grasp.

As debating fits well into the original purpose of college life, it is not surprising that it has so long occupied a place there. Between 1840 and 1860 it held a position of preëminence; receiving a greater share of attention than any other feature of undergraduate activity. Indeed nearly every student took some part in it.

Investigation shows that not a few of our great men acquired in this way their incentive to effort, and their earliest training for later achievements. Among the records of the debating societies of Williams College are found many accounts of the debates between the late President Garfield and Ex-Senator Ingalls. The occasions, when these two were pitted against each other,—occasions when even standing-room was at a premium,—are well remembered. It is interesting to note how plainly the characteristics of these distinguished men were already visible in this college work. A spectator at one of their battles describes Garfield as a "slow debater," but cool, reliable, showing excellent judgment, and descending with unerring accuracy and force on his opponent's weak points; while Ingalls was quick, brilliant, sarcastic, and lightning-like in thought and expression.

In the early sixties, debating began gradually to decline in interest. This may have been due to a general depression in educational work; for nearly every institution suffered a diminution in numbers and, consequently, a reduction of activity in all departments. About fifteen years ago, when matters collegiate were reviving, the great athletic contests came into being; absorbing the attention of the students. Debating, however, continued dormant.

It is only within the last few years that the great intercollegiate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

debating leagues have been formed; giving to this work the stimulus of public notice. But, once revived, probably nothing in the world of education has made more rapid progress. At present there are no less than a score of collegiate debating leagues in all parts of the country. Yale, Harvard, and Princeton have annual contests; the University of Pennsylvania debates with Cornell; Williams, with Dartmouth; and Columbia, looking to the West, has found an opponent in the University of Chicago. The most novel arrangement, however, is that of Northwestern University and the Universities of Michigan, Chicago, and Minnesota. These, about a year ago, formed the Central Debating League,—the most comprehensive union of the kind yet produced. The four universities dispute in groups of two each; and, later, the winners of these two contests meet for a final battle. Additional leagues are continually being formed. Not many months ago Dartmouth started a new one with Brown; indeed, nearly every centre of learning takes part, at least once a year, in some affair of this sort.

This activity permeates the atmosphere of each college; and positions on the team of debaters for a great intercollegiate struggle are obtained only after a most rigorous and exhaustive competition. There can be no doubt as to the desirability of this competitive work. It produces good debaters; and a good debater must be an apt compiler of authorities and statistics, an expert thinker, and able to select the vital points on which the fate of an argument depends. Withal he must be a speaker of sufficient ability to put his whole spirit into the point he wishes to make, and thus arouse the interest and sympathy of his audience.

Usually the intercollegiate debating teams consist of three men, with an alternate or substitute. In most cases, one of these has the supervision of the preparation for the debate; though, necessarily, each must have a large degree of freedom in his individual work.

There are various methods of preparing and selecting these men. At Cornell they are chosen, ordinarily, from the seven debating societies, where they have the best opportunity for drill. Largely through excellent preparation, Cornell has defeated the University of Pennsylvania for two successive years. Princeton has two societies, the "Clio" and the "Whig," between which there exists a strong rivalry. At Harvard are the "Union" and the "Forum." Columbia, Williams, and the University of North Carolina also have each two rival societies for such training. Harvard and Columbia allow the greatest freedom of competition for places on the team. A public meeting is held, when a cer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tain subject is announced for argument. Candidates may speak on either side; and from these, a committee of the faculty selects the successful debaters. As there are sometimes a large number of contestants, the meeting is not a brief one. At Yale there are preliminary trials in each of the several departments of the University. The successful men afterward compete before a committee of professors for final choice. The chief factor in training men at New Haven is the Yale Union, the debating organization of the academic departments. There is a separate union among the freshmen, which debates with the Harvard freshmen. The University of Michigan has, in its Literature Department, four societies which, by a series of trials, decide upon their best three men, who compete with representatives of the Law Department for places on the team. At Dartmouth each of the fraternities, as well as the "Neutrals," or non-fraternity men, presents its best speakers, from whom the choice is made. Several colleges, notably Harvard and Cornell, have made systematic training in debate a part of the regular curriculum. This work is always apparent in the final debate, and often results in victory where the opposing college has no such system.

After the debaters are selected, the first task in preparing for an intercollegiate contest is the choice of a question for discussion. This is done in accordance with the debating constitution which the opposing colleges have adopted. Often one party has the privilege of submitting several topics, of which its opponents select one; choosing the side on which it prefers to stand. These positions are reversed the following year. With Yale, Harvard, and Princeton, the home college selects the question; while the visiting debaters are entitled to choice of side. In other cases this point is decided by lot. The Central Debating League above-mentioned departs from the usual practice; the selection of both judges and question being made by a council composed of alumni of the institutions interested. These methods leave each college with well-defined positions approximately equal in desirability. In the case of a seemingly unfair question, such an equality is often produced by loading one side with conditions, or by giving it additional points to prove. For example: With the subject, "*Resolved*, That municipalities should own and operate plants for supplying gas," the difficulty of the negative side is enhanced by adding the proviso, "if such action would not increase official corruption"; and the burden of the affirmative is made heavier by including in the question not only plants for supplying gas, but also those for furnishing water, electricity, and surface transportation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The questions chosen to-day are very different from those discussed in the local debates of forty years ago. At that time such subjects as the following were in vogue; viz., "*Resolved*, That ambition is a stronger incentive to action than fear." "*Resolved*, That the existence and attributes of the Supreme Being can be proved without the aid of divine revelation." These topics would hardly evoke the interest that was felt when Harvard and Yale recently discussed the annexation of Hawaii; Dartmouth and Williams, the city ownership of public franchises; Cornell and the University of Pennsylvania, the compulsory arbitration of labor disputes; and the University of Michigan and Northwestern University, the Government construction of the Nicaragua Canal. In short, at present a successful debate must involve a live issue.

The question having been chosen, the real work of preparation begins. Every book and authority pertinent to the subject must be thoroughly canvassed, every telling point secured, every probable argument of the other side investigated and answers prepared. In fact, each detail must be completely absorbed and understood in all its bearings. If the question be one involving a law or custom in any locality, numerous letters must be written and, sometimes, visits made to discover proof of its success or failure. A certain Wisconsin college, which was to argue the Prohibition Question, sent representatives to Maine for the purpose of observing the operation of the prohibitory law of that State. It is hardly necessary to say, however, that such long pilgrimages are not of common occurrence.

Frequently this preparatory labor is supplemented by practice in the home college, whereby the team is trained and strengthened by trial debates on the question; being opposed by the best debaters available. In some cases the three speakers and the alternate discuss the subject in public: two are on either side. They are thus given a better knowledge of the arguments they must meet. At Yale, a further improvement is proposed, by choosing not only the three regular debaters, but also three others who will act as a permanent "scrub" team, the members of which will have the hope of replacing the "Varsity" men by doing good work in these practice disputes.

Thus it will be seen that the preparation for an intercollegiate debate involves a large amount of work. In consideration of this the colleges have different methods of recognizing their representatives, on the same principle that they reward their foot-ball and base-ball champions by allowing them to wear the initial of the college on cap or sweater. For instance, Yale disputants are given handsome gold watch-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charms, bearing on one side the head of Demosthenes, and, on the other, the name of the owner, and the debate in which he is to take part. This college also offers several prizes to the best debaters; and, by agreement with Yale, Harvard, and Princeton, the winning team receives a trophy banner, which is hung in some conspicuous spot for future admiration. Similarly the Williams debaters are rewarded with pins or watch-charms; while Harvard and a number of the other colleges show their appreciation by the gift of "shingles," or certificates, to the effect that the owner has represented his *Alma Mater* in debate. These somewhat resemble college diplomas in appearance, though more ornate, and are sometimes elaborately engraved and beautified. The University of Michigan has a more practical mode of recompense. Her debaters receive $75, $50, and $30 respectively. Money rewards are given in many other colleges.

Team-work is almost as important in debate as in foot-ball or rowing; and, as the aggregate amount of time allowed to each side is seldom over fifty minutes, a team, to win, must use every second to advantage. To secure this result, it is usually best for a team to maintain the special line of thought agreed upon beforehand, and shun the alluring challenges and interpolations of the other side. This was illustrated not long ago in a debate between two of our greatest universities having equal chances of victory. At the outset, one party challenged its opponent to answer several skilfully put questions. The bait was accepted; and several precious moments were used in the responses. As a result, the questioned side had to omit, or cut short, its own carefully prepared and important arguments. At the close of the debate, the questioners calmly showed that neither interrogations nor answers had any actual bearing on the subject; and, having employed their own time to advantage, they won the debate.

At times, also, the exclusive possession of some important information, withheld until the final moment and then emphasized to the greatest extent, will outweigh former arguments and secure the judges' decision. Cornell won from the University of Pennsylvania last March by throwing on the latter the burden of proof with so adroit and fierce an onslaught that they had to accept it, and place themselves on the defensive,—a position almost invariably leading to defeat. On the other hand, rebuttal work must not be neglected; only it should be reserved for its proper place, and should not interfere with the main arguments. To her excellence in such use of the rebuttal are attributed the successive victories of Yale over Harvard for the past three years;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and her defeats by Princeton were caused by the still greater superiority of the "Tigers" in this same particular.

Formerly aid from the faculty was a great factor. One distinguished instructor even claimed that the team of his college was triumphant because of superior learning among the professors. This would be hardly possible at present; for faculty assistance, except to a very limited extent, is considered a violation of ethics, as being to debating what professionalism is to athletics.

In spite of all possible labor and skill, the element of luck sometimes decides debating contests as well as other struggles. A sudden confusion or forgetfulness, or an attack of illness, has not seldom brought about an undeserved defeat.

The debates between two colleges are held alternately at each, in some hall on the campus or other public building. A speaker is allowed from ten to fifteen minutes; and each address on the affirmative precedes one on the negative. When all have spoken, the leader of the affirmative makes a rebuttal speech of about five minutes; summing up the entire argument and pointing out the weak points of the opposition. The leader on the negative then follows a similar course. With the larger universities all the speakers are allowed short rebuttals. Next comes the decision of the judges,—usually three in number,—who are prominent alumni of both colleges, or noted lawyers and statesmen.

As the debaters are becoming more expert, the public interest in their forensic battles is increasing. Those between important colleges are decided by men of the highest rank and ability, and are heard by thousands. Indeed, it is often difficult to secure a hall of sufficient size to accommodate the audience. Among the older alumni there is perhaps a stronger desire that their *Alma Mater* should be triumphant in an important debate than in an athletic contest. Also, from the undergraduates, in both Eastern and Western colleges, debating must continue to receive increasing attention; since, though involving much confining labor, it leads directly to the professions which many of them will pursue in after-life. To prospective members of the bar, especially, such work is of the greatest advantage; for "every law-case is a debate."

During the last few months some notable and instructive debates have taken place. In April occurred the annual contest between Yale and Princeton, at which Ex-President Cleveland presided. On that occasion, Yale defeated the New Jersey university for the first time in several years. Princeton's ill luck continued; for again, in May, she surrendered to Harvard, who supported the affirmative of the question, "*Re-*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

solved, That the present restrictions on immigration into the United States are insufficient." The victory of the crimson seemed due to judicious combinations of prepared arguments and extemporaneous rebuttal. Probably a verdict was never more quickly agreed upon, as the judges required less than two minutes for consultation. Somewhat similar in this respect was the Williams-Dartmouth debate a few days later. The decision in that case was practically reached before the men had ceased speaking; although the formality of a consultation was observed. The victory came to Williams, which maintained the negative of a proposition to reform the laws of Massachusetts relating to taxation. This result was secured by careful selection of the important arguments and by clearness of presentation. Another interesting debate was held at Ann Arbor between the Universities of Michigan and Chicago. The former affirmed, "That the action of the Senate in rejecting the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and England, was wise." The decision was in favor of the University of Michigan on the ground of effective team-work and excellent delivery. The Chicago debaters lost in relatively unimportant objections the time necessary to advance constructive arguments to meet those of their opponents. The first debate of the new league between Dartmouth and Brown was won by the former because of superior work in rebuttal. All of these contests were characterized by a noticeably greater display of perceptive power, logic, and oratory than those of previous years.

In general, the present system of intercollegiate discussion can hardly fail to commend itself to all interested in educational progress; for, in this way, the powerful incentive of college spirit and rivalry, of individual competition and success, supplies what is so often lacking in the student's labor, and is so necessary to his advancement—the feeling of personal intimacy and personal enthusiasm.

CECIL FREDERICK BACON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INDUSTRIAL INVESTIGATIONS: FALLACIOUS STATISTICS AND ERRONEOUS GENERALIZATIONS.

THE creation of an industrial commission by Congress "to investigate the questions pertaining to immigration, to labor, to agriculture, to manufacture, and to business, and to report to Congress and to suggest such legislation as it may deem best upon the subjects," suggests the idea that Congress does not consider the information in its possession as satisfactory. The scope of inquiry is extensive enough. It covers, virtually, the entire economic fabric.

The Commission is created for the term of two years, when its final report is to be made to Congress. Five Senators, five Members of the House of Representatives, and nine other persons "who shall fairly represent the different industries and employments," to be appointed by the President, will compose the Commission. Much useful information can be gathered by a body of nineteen men, authorized to divide itself into subcommissions, to make investigations in any part of the United States, to travel, to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths and affirmations. The power is ample.

The usefulness of the information thus to be obtained will depend largely upon a proper classification of the subjects to be inquired into, and upon a limitation of the inquiry to what is germane to the subject itself. These considerations are important; for, under the law creating the Commission, the field of its inquiries is virtually unlimited, so that the Commission must guard against a diffuseness of effort apt to prove detrimental to the results. The subjects of Business, Agriculture, Manufacturing, and Labor are vast enough to be treated by themselves and by independent bodies of experts. To be sufficiently posted on any one of them, so as to be able to conduct an investigation with intelligence, requires no small amount of training. Insight enough into all four of these divisions of economic science to know on what parts to turn the searchlight of inquiry, is rarely found even among our best thinkers, whether in or out of Congress. Indeed, though it is not so expressed, the very act of creating this Commission betokens a dissatisfaction with the treatment these great economic questions have been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

receiving from statisticians and political economists. The feeling manifests itself not in America alone, but in Europe as well.

During the last fifty years the science of statistics has made great strides. A great deal of information is collected, more reliably, perhaps, than formerly, when the means at the disposal of statistical bureaus were not so liberal as at the present time. In profuseness, statistical publications leave nothing to wish for. The critical expert would indeed rather see less matter and more scrutiny on the part of the officials in charge of the compilations. In our agricultural statistics the crop figures of the Department of Agriculture are often so far below what later developments prove, that few now accept them without allowing for their habitual shortcomings. As commercial houses have succeeded in establishing a reputation for gathering fairly satisfactory data on crops in which they are specially interested, it is difficult to see why the Department cannot organize a service which will prevent annual discrepancies in estimates of from fifty to one hundred million bushels in the wheat-crop alone.

In the statistics dealing with industrial matters the conditions for gathering correct data are certainly very favorable. The means placed at the command of the Census Bureau are usually so liberal that its figures ought to be quite reliable. But this is by no means the case. Our manufacturing industries for 1880 show $5,369,579,191; those for 1890, $9,372,437,283—an increase of four thousand millions, or 74%, in a period of ten years. Part of this increase is due to the fact that quite a number of new items are tabulated in the Census of 1890 which were never enumerated before in manufacturing industries. These belong to the retail trade, or represent finishing or refining processes which can hardly be called manufacturing industries, or relate to products for immediate consumption, like gasmaking, etc. They represent a total of five hundred millions. Besides this, the articles enumerated appear two, three, and four times; first in a raw form, and then again in a more or less finished form. As an index to the state and growth of industries, the method of enumeration would not call for criticism; but a wrong impression is created, and the basis for very erroneous deductions is laid, by the footing up of all into one general total. The cloth certainly loses its identity in the coat, as does the yarn in the cloth, and the wool in the yarn. A coat represented in the line of clothing at $5 is the finality of all these industrial contributions; but in the various items of manufacturing industries, the Census would easily show $10 of salable values.

As all the materials have originally been introduced in the condi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion in which they have been taken from the field, the forest, or the mine, they have all found enumeration under the respective headings of "Agriculture," "Forestry," or "Mining." The additional value produced by industry is, therefore, that given by the labor and expense necessary to the completion of an article of manufacture. If we deduct the cost of the materials from the totals, we have the additional values alone remaining which are germane to manufacturing industries.

In the Census of Manufactures the part occupied by wages, expense, and capital charges, which are all that can be rightfully credited to manufacturing industries, amounted to $1,954,000,000 in 1880, and to $4,035,000,000 in 1890. This is a growth of 100 per cent, even after deducting items in the last Census which had not been given place in that of 1880. But to call the sum of our industrial productiveness four thousand millions is quite a different thing from calling it nine thousand millions, as is stated in the Census.

That erroneous views on economic and sociological questions are created by these inflated Census figures is obvious.

The same can be said of wage statistics. The looseness with which such statistics have been collected is well illustrated by the clothing industry. More than any other, this industry, during the last ten years, has been brought to public notice by the frequent occurrence of strikes. In New York the spring and fall seasons have been ushered in by cloakmakers' strikes with remarkable regularity. The strikes in the men's clothing trade have been sufficiently frequent to mark the industry as a fit counterpart of the cloak trade. The public has an impression that such frequent occurrence of strikes betokens a state of depression and a low wage-rate. Not alone strikers, but also committees reporting to their respective legislative bodies, have furnished data from which we can readily understand why thousands of working men and women should subject themselves and those depending on them to the sinister effects of a long strike, rather than submit to conditions under which they believed they would sink still lower. This is the more remarkable when we consider that those engaged in the struggles had been but recently landed from countries where famine reigns in perennial frequency, where poverty is the general lot, and where a sufficiency of bread throughout the year for the family would be considered a blessing by 90 per cent of the population.

Now, let us see what the Census states with regard to the earnings of these workers.

In men's clothing we find the following figures: 9,235 adult males,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with average earnings of $698; 8,349 piece-workers, averaging $684; and 5,021 piece-workers, having "materials furnished," averaging $478. In the manufacture of women's clothing we have 3,455 males, earning $697; and 1,779 outside workers, earning $598. The average annual earnings of 7,850 females employed in the clothing industries were $404. A standing complaint concerning this industry is that it is season business, and that a great majority of the workers cannot count on employment for more than eight or nine months in the year. But, as few employments can show better average earnings under far more steady working conditions, it would seem, from the Census returns, that the workers could very well provide for the dull months out of yearly earnings which would be considered ample in industries with full working-time throughout the year.

The matter becomes still more difficult of comprehension when we compare the average earnings of 1890 with those of 1880, in which latter year the congested conditions of 1890 did not yet exist. As returned by the Census, the average earnings in 1890 of all employed in the men's clothing trade, including males and females,—58,105 in all,—were $514. In the women's clothing trade they were $498; the number of employees of all classes being 32,839. In 1880, the average yearly earnings of all employed in the men's clothing trade were $300; while those in the women's clothing trade were $320.

No more fruitful field could be offered to a commission clothed with ample power than is presented by this industry in the city of New York. Why this restiveness? Why these constantly recurring strikes? Why these complaints and outcries against the sweating system? Why this continual tightening of the lines against immigration? Were there in 1880 any such manifestations of unrest as were apparent in 1890? If the annual earnings of some ninety thousand workers in the clothing industry were from 50 to 75 per cent higher than they were in 1880, under all the baneful influences that had in the meantime arisen, then a great deal of shamming has been practised, and tens of thousands of workpeople have been acting the part of starvelings; living ostensibly in squalor and misery, while, according to the Census, their earnings enabled them to live in comfort and to lay by a goodly sum for a rainy day. This would at least apply to our native working population, who have not had the schooling in privation which the newcomers had in the land of their birth. It must be remembered that these people have strong family ties, and that their occupation enables them to work in family groups. If they do not work in groups,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they work separately, but live with their families. In the large majority of instances there are two, three, or four workers in a family, who combine their earnings; and the aggregate would enable such a family to make progress toward comfort at a rate which few other classes of workers enjoy. If the conditions are as we see them, and the evidence before commissions of inquiry is to be trusted, then there is but one alternative, namely, our Census figures are untrustworthy.

I admit the difficulty of obtaining reliable data when we are compelled to depend entirely on the willingness of the informant to give correct figures as to the details of his business. But this does not make the published figures any more reliable; and it is certainly very unsafe for economists to accept them, as a basis for their reasoning, without subjecting them to a careful analysis.

This, however, is precisely the danger to which we are exposed when we accept the figures of our economic writers. Few of them are able to deal with industrial statistics, because by their training they know little or nothing of the manner in which an industry is conducted, or under what conditions trade is carried on. The treatment of wages as a factor in production may serve as an example. Wages and the cost of labor are confounded almost without exception. Official figures of earnings, usually compiled in the loose manner described above, are taken indiscriminately, and, naturally, carry with them germs for the propagation of a great number of erroneous generalizations. As a rule, such generalizations leave the working-classes, to whom they are chiefly addressed, unmoved, because these people know that the statements are not based on the facts with which they are familiar. Earnings on paper do not fill empty stomachs; nor do time wages give an idea of the cost of labor.

Much uneasiness has of late been manifested by reason of the inroads made by the Southern States into the cotton industry of New England. The cause of this condition is attributed to the higher rate of wages prevailing in the Eastern States. A great deal of investigating has been undertaken by legislative committees, by manufacturers' delegations, and by special reporters despatched by newspapers to the South to write up the special phases of the industry. A writer in the June number of THE FORUM summarizes the situation; and, as he but reflects the general view as expressed in public print, I shall quote him here:

"These investigations have thrown a flood of new light upon the advantages of cotton-milling in the South, and caused New England capitalists to entertain a different view respecting the manufacturing possibilities of that section. They have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with one accord concluded that the South has an insuperable advantage in cheap labor, and that the mills of the East cannot at present compete with those of the South without cutting down wages. Hence the general precipitate reduction of wages in New England early in the year." [1]

The writer proceeds upon the assumption that the Southern operative is as well equipped as the Northern mill-hand, while living is as much cheaper as the amount representing the difference in wages.

"The lower cost of living, then, accounts for the difference in the wages paid. Let us see exactly how much this difference is. According to the Report of the U. S. Commissioner of Labor for 1893, the average income of cotton-weavers per family in the Carolinas was $412.09: the average in Massachusetts was $524.28, or 27 per cent higher than in the South. It must be remembered that a family in the South is upon the average larger, and that there is a larger percentage of workers to each family than in Massachusetts. The Arkwright Club reported that wages in Massachusetts were 40 per cent above those in the South, which is no doubt nearer the truth. In addition to the lower money-wages, the Southern mills have the advantage of an hour or an hour and a half longer work-day.

As the cost of labor is the chief item in cotton-manufacturing,—87 per cent, according to Mr. Atkinson,—and as the South has an advantage of 30 or 40 per cent in this particular, it is idle to expect New England to compete with the South unless this advantage is offset by some disadvantages." [2]

In the opinion of this writer the latter are not great enough to counterbalance the advantages which the South possesses over New England; and I fully agree with him. The disadvantages certainly cannot overcome a difference of "30 or 40 per cent" in the cost of labor. But upon what is this statement of differences in the labor-cost based? Upon time wages and family earnings in the North and in the South. The cost of living is cheaper in the South than in the North: "the Southern operative can get more in return for his labor." He can live as well as the Northern operative on less money. This is all we receive as evidence in support of the statement that the cost of labor is higher in the North than in the South.

If we scan all the reviews and newspaper columns filled with articles treating this subject, we find little beyond statements of rates of wages, *i.e.*, time earnings, as evidence that the labor-cost is lower in the South than in the North; and these are sometimes accompanied with statements of living expenses in proof of the effectiveness of the economic advantage of low wages possessed by the South.

Now these statements may be ever so important to the social economist, and ever so interesting from a statistical point of view; but they

[1] Prof. JEROME DOWD, in "Textile War Between the North and the South." THE FORUM for June, 1898, p. 438.

[2] *Id.*, pp. 441–2.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fail entirely to give a clew to the all-important factor of the comparative cost of labor.

That the rate of wages and the hours of weekly or daily working-time furnish no basis for estimating the cost of labor in industrial production is eminently illustrated by the cotton industry. This industry is conducted on the same principle in all the industrial countries of Europe, but with varying results. The following are the average rates of wages and working-hours, as I found them on personal investigation in 1887:

AVERAGE RATES OF WAGES AND LENGTH OF WORKING-DAY IN 1887.

COUNTRY.	Average Wages Per Day.	Number of Hours Per Day.	Wages Per Hour.
England	86 cents.	9	9.55 cents.
Germany	54 "	11	4.91 "
Switzerland	54 "	11	4.91 "
France	54 "	12	4.50 "
Eastern Bohemia	26 "	12½	2.08 "
Western Bohemia	36 "	12½	2.88 "

Judging by the general estimate, the low wages and long hours of Bohemia ought to be a menace to Germany. Saxony, however, does not feel the pinch of Bohemian competition even in unprotected or neutral markets; but it does feel the competition of England, where wages, reckoned by the hour, are about 100 per cent higher. In the plea for protective duties on cotton goods, at the time the present rates were fixed, German manufacturers were not particularly concerned about the competition they were subjected to on their own borders by labor receiving less than one-half the rate they were paying: but they were very much concerned in regard to the competition of English producers, in spite of the fact that the latter paid nearly double the German rate of wages; and no less were they concerned about American competition, conducted under a rate even higher than the English.

American cotton goods were able to compete successfully with German goods on German soil, and to pay in addition an import duty of $7.50 per hundredweight, equal to about 20 per cent on the value at that time. These phenomena are inexplicable if we take the day-rate of wages as a gauge with which to measure the cost of production.

As a result of extended inquiry into the economy of production of different countries, it may in a general way be stated, of most of the great industries, that the cost of labor stands in an inverse ratio to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

daily wages of the laborer. And very direct proof of this statement can be found in the cotton industry. The proof, however, can be supplied only by statements of comparative cost, not by citing labor statistics. Statistics are of value only when dealing with specific kinds of cloth, in connection with out-put per hand, equipment, and working methods of mills; not by statements of day-wages, cost of living, and prices of commodities.

To make satisfactory comparisons of this nature it was necessary to select an article possessing the same specific characteristics in the countries manufacturing cotton goods in power mills, under systems of division of labor as nearly akin as possible. The article that offered these requirements was our print cloth,—a cloth 28 inches wide, and counting 64 threads to the inch, weft and warp alike. But, while this industry is supposed to be conducted everywhere on the same principles, we find, on closer examination, that many differences exist in the conduct of the mills of different countries. As I cannot, however, enter into technical details without exceeding the limits of this article, I shall speak here only of the loom practice. Looms can be run in one way only, that is, by the superintending of the movement of the shuttle by operatives. The cost of labor per 100 yards of print cloth, as described, I found to be as follows: In Switzerland, 60 cents; in England, 48 cents; in Lowell, 40 cents. The daily average of wages was: In Switzerland, 49 cents; in England, 65 cents; in Lowell, 85 cents. The average number of looms attended by one weaver in the mills of Switzerland and Germany was about $2\frac{1}{2}$; in England, about $3\frac{1}{2}$; and in America, about $6\frac{1}{2}$. The larger number of looms attended by one person explains the higher wages by the day and the lower cost of labor by the piece. The larger the number of looms run by one hand, the closer the attention required; and as fines for faulty places cut deep into the weaver's wages, it can be imagined that she generally keeps a watchful eye on her looms. The American's higher earnings are therefore realized at an expense of nerve-power which the European operative is not required to expend on her work. For every unit of pay received the American operative is obliged to turn out more yards, pounds, or pieces than the operative in England; the English more than the German; and the German more than the Austrian.

The high wage-rate is a prerequisite to cheap production. The free institutions of this country would, under all circumstances, offer opportunities unexampled elsewhere for the attainment of a generally high standard of wages. This high standard has been the great inducement

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the introduction of improvements in the economy of production, which would not be considered worth undertaking in countries of a low wage-standard. The replacement of machinery is necessarily connected with considerable monetary outlay. To condemn to the junk-heap sound machinery capable of turning out satisfactory work, would be thought of only if adequate results could be obtained by the sacrifice. The operative would have to see a prospect of better earnings in the change, or he would resist the lower piece-rate under which alone the improved device could be found a profitable investment by the manufacturer. The rate of progress at which improvements are introduced runs parallel with the rate of wages paid in the various countries.

In my work, "The Economy of High Wages," I have cited a number of facts illustrating the difference in methods, one of which may find room here.

After an examination of a cotton-mill in Switzerland, I exchanged notes with the superintendent on mill-management and cost of equipment. Finding the cost per spindle and per loom to be three times as high as what I knew it to be in England, and expressing surprise, I received the noteworthy reply, that they knew their mill outfit was far more expensive, but that it was "so much better and lasted that much longer."

In view of what we know of American mill practice, this is an advantage of very doubtful value. Recent experience is a clear demonstration of the revolutionary effect of improved machinery on trade conditions. The latest improvements introduced into cotton-mills have produced differences in cost of labor that far outweigh any possible advantages the South may have over the North by reason of lower wages. While the present price for weaving 100 yards of print cloth is 32 cents (against 36 cents a year ago, when the weaving-price for the same cloth in England was 44 cents), weaving in the same place, or, for that matter, even, in the same mill, is being done at 18 cents the 100 yards. And, what is no less remarkable, the operatives in the latter case earn more money per day than those working at the higher rate.

Now, by no possibility can the strain which the North could be subjected to by the South be so great as the strain the Northern mill has to sustain from Northern mill, and the Southern mill from Southern mill; for the same causes may be found in operation in the South that produce the differences in the North. The differences of this pronounced type are created by the introduction of the so-called "automatic" loom. When, by this change, 50 per cent in the weaving-cost

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can be saved, it is obvious that it will not take long to convince mill-owners that it is profitable to discard the loom which was satisfactory until very recently and to adopt the new loom by which an expert weaver can turn out from two to three times as much cloth in a week. The pressure of tool on tool would be certainly greater than that of Southern wage on Northern wage, even were the differences as great as would be indicated by the numerous statements in circulation. The tool that can produce these results will either enter every mill as quickly as it can be put in, or the mill will be driven out of existence. The process will not take long in America, under conditions with which we are so familiar, and which have been described above. The causes of conservatism on the part of European manufacturers are not entirely due to lack of enterprise. The differences in practice simply accord with the varying conditions under which trade and the industries are conducted in the different countries. But, whatever the causes that lead to these differences, in America no one conducting an industrial enterprise can escape the consequences, if he fail to fall in with the pace his neighbor has set for him. Under such circumstances great disturbances are apt to sweep over trade centres, which disturbances are due, however, to causes quite other than differences in rates of wages, cost of living, etc. The South is no less subjected to these general conditions than the North.

It is clear, from what I have said, that the differences in cost of production are owing largely to the advantage which the South possesses over the North in the later construction of the Southern mills. A member of the editorial staff of the "New York Journal of Commerce," Mr. Mercer, was sent South last spring by his paper to inquire into this subject. As his observations are of recent date, and bear the stamp of being those of an expert, they may be cited here. He says:

"The mills of the South are, in the majority, new mills. The mills whose competition we hear about so much are the mills erected during the last five or six years. All such mills have new machinery, and of the latest type. There was a time when the South was a dumping-ground for the old machinery of the East; but it is so no longer. The new mills are built on the most approved plans; they are well built; they are fitted out with all the latest details, with due regard to economy in handling,—and in that respect the modern mill of the South will compare, without disparagement in any particular, with the very best mills in New England. The manufacturers are perfectly willing to try any new devices that may come out in the way of new machinery; and no better example of that can be given than the fact that the automatic loom has found its home in the South almost exclusively, and the advantages of the automatic loom are, by the Southern manufacturers, deemed to be very much in its favor, as against the ordinary running loom. Sev-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eral manufacturers said, in fact, that it was not hard work to secure 97¼ per cent of the full possible production of the loom."

How the introduction of this new loom affects the cost of labor may be shown by a comparison of two accounts of the cost of labor in print cloth, one taken by myself from a mill account of older date, but from one of the best mills in New England, and the other from the workings of recent date received from a mill but a few days ago.

COST OF LABOR IN ONE POUND OF PRINT CLOTH (28 INCHES, 64×64, SEVEN YARDS TO THE POUND).

ITEMS.	1887. Cents.	1898. Cents.	Differences 1898. Cents.
Carding	0.855	0.7	−0.155
Spinning	1.137	1.1	−0.037
Preparing for loom	0.697	0.7	+0.003
Weaving	2.8	1.6	−1.2
Other labor expenses	0.239	0.25	+0.011
Total labor cost	5.728	4.35	−1.378
Difference on account of improved loom	.....	.....	−1.2
All other differences	.....	.....	−0.178

The items covering all other manufacturing processes are scarcely worth noticing. The difference is almost entirely traceable to the new loom. But still we are told that

"the chief advantage of the South, and which the manufacturers themselves claim to be the only one, is in the wages they pay and the hours they run."

Of how little consequence are these latter is shown by the further remarks of the writer:

"The difference between wages paid in the different parts in the South is much greater between Georgia and other States than between Georgia and New England; but this has been no check to the growth in the State of Georgia itself."

We are told this by a careful observer, who gathered his data from a number of books submitted to him while in the South taking ranges of wages. I shall introduce his list of wages here, and supplement it with an extract of the wages paid in Massachusetts mills in 1891 for the same employments, as stated in the Report of the Senate Committee on Wholesale Prices, Wages, Transportation, etc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Operatives.	North Carolina.	South Carolina.	Georgia.	Alabama.	Three Mills in Massachusetts.	
					Low Average.	High Average.
Carders	$0.80	$0.85	$0.95	$0.73	$1.00	
Speeders	.75	.78	.90	.80	.85	$1.12
Spoolers	.78	.78	.90	.60	.85	
Spinners	.65	.56	.75	.54	.84	1.20
Weavers	.85	.90	1.00	.90	.70	1.20

The differences in rates between the various mills of Massachusetts, as reported in the Senate Report, are, it will be seen, much greater than the differences between the rates of Georgia and the lower ones of Massachusetts. It must be remembered, besides, that the rates given for Massachusetts are for 1891, and that those given for the South are for 1898.

"The general precipitate reduction of wages in New England early in this year," has been called to our attention so pointedly that we must give this matter also due weight in the comparison. But after all has been said, and due allowance has been made for every claim in regard to differences in wages, what bearing has this upon the question? To measure the cost of labor in a given product by the rate of day wages is like an attempt to measure fluids with the yard-stick.

Mill work is paid by the piece, by the yard, by the pound, and not by the day; or it is paid by the number of machines run at a certain speed, attended by one operative, which is again the same as paying by the piece. A gentleman whose vast interests in cotton manufacturing enable him to speak with authority on the subject, estimates that "approximately four-fifths of the labor-cost of cloth is paid for by the pound." "I should estimate," he proceeds to say, "that one-half the carding, all the spinning, five-sevenths of the preparing yarn for looms, and the weaving is paid for directly by the pound."

It is not difficult to compare the labor-cost of different countries and different sections if we proceed on such lines as I have indicated. But we can never obtain intelligent results if we endeavor to measure the cost of production by the usual means; and we must be careful not to omit the equipment of the respective mills whose output is under consideration. It is of equal importance to bear in mind that the species of cloth made in the South differ from those made in New England, and that comparisons must be founded on similarity of product.

To take all this into account is a difficult matter. It is easy to pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ceed on lines of averages of wages, hours of labor, and to generalize on the Reports of the Labor Bureau and the Census. The other method requires technical and expert knowledge in special fields; but its results are much more satisfactory to those directly interested in the great controversies of the day—the capitalist and the laborer. The investigations must be analytical. We must not take anything for granted, but, before we proceed, must make sure of the ground on which we stand.

I may, in conclusion, repeat what I stated in my "Report on Technical Education in Europe," as it still applies to the present manner of proceeding in economic inquiries. I therein stated:

"Our literature is as full of the philosophy of industrial life as it is wanting in facts regarding it,—facts as they present themselves under the influence of modern development. We have, therefore, to gather the data and collect the facts of production with careful minuteness. The economy of production will have to be treated in the same analytical manner of investigation by which all the natural sciences have made such wonderful progress within the last fifty years. National biology is as truly a positive science as individual biology. Abandoning the hazy abstractions of the speculative past, science has, by the aid of the microscope, the balance, and the retort, brought to light some of nature's most deeply hidden secrets. Under the results of this great scientific upheaval, life has become a changed condition. Industrial life, conditions and means governing production, transportation, distribution,—all have experienced changes as pronounced as are the differences between the life and aspirations of the American mechanic and the life and aspirations of the Hindoo workman. The application of electricity and steam-power to production and transportation has revolutionized industrial and economic conditions and the lives and prospects of the working-classes to a greater degree than any other event in the history of man. Still it is not too much to say, that the economic generalizations of the day are largely founded on the facts of a past era."

JACOB SCHOENHOF.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BYRON REVIVAL.

It is now some years since the late Prof. Nichol, in his excellent life of Byron, declared that his hero was "resuming his place," and that the closing quarter of the century would reverse the unjust verdict against him pronounced by the second and third quarters. Shortly after this statement was made, Matthew Arnold, as though to confirm its truth, published his well-known volume of selections from Byron's poetry, and maintained in his preface, that when the year 1900 should be turned, the two chief names of modern English poetry would be those of Wordsworth and Byron. To the latter claim, Mr. Swinburne immediately replied, in what purported to be a critical essay on the two poets just named, but was really a marvellous exhibition of inveterate and unconscionable prejudice.

As might have been expected, Mr. Swinburne, too, had a pair of chief poets to set up—to wit, Shelley and Coleridge. The controversy thus begun received some attention from the critics; but the general public was more interested in reading Tennyson and in forming Browning clubs. If the tide of favor began setting toward Byron, its movement was practically imperceptible; for as late as 1896 Prof. George Saintsbury could maintain, without serious loss to his reputation as a critic, that Scott could not be ranked below Byron on any sound theory of poetical criticism, and that the latter could not be read in close juxtaposition with a real poet like Shelley without disastrous results to his fame.

Twelve months later, however, Byron was being more discussed, if not more read. The war between Greece and Turkey naturally induced men to ponder upon his disinterested devotion to the cause of Hellas and upon the glorious close of his wayward life. The newspapers took him up; and certainly those of Paris, where I happened to be at the time, did not bear out the opinion afterward expressed to me by a great French critic, who was doubtless in the right, that the influence of Byron had somewhat waned in France.

Close upon this transient notoriety, came an important proof that the great poet's fame was not destitute of champions in his native land

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after the death of Matthew Arnold. The first volume of a critical edition of his complete works, under the editorship of Mr. W. E. Henley, was issued and cordially received; and it was announced that Mr. John Murray would shortly draw on his stores of manuscripts, and publish an edition which should be practically final. Accordingly we now have Mr. Henley's edition of the Letters from 1804 to 1813,[1] and two volumes of the Murray edition—one containing the earlier poems, edited by Mr. Ernest Hartley Coleridge, and one containing Letters dating from 1798 to 1811, edited by Mr. Rowland E. Prothero.[2] Both editions are to be in twelve volumes; and the publishers promise to complete them without loss of time.

The simultaneous appearance of two such rival editions would be noteworthy in the case of any poet, but is particularly remarkable in the case of Byron. As Mr. Henley says, his own is "practically the first reissue on novel and peculiar lines which has been attempted for close on seventy years." There have been innumerable popular editions of Byron to satisfy a demand which some booksellers pronounce constant, but others declare to be falling off; yet, to the present year, if anyone wished to do critical work on the poet, he had to resort mainly to the seventeen-volume Murray edition of 1832. The general excellence of this may partly account for the fact that in an age famous for textual criticism Byron did not receive until recently an honor long ago paid to Shelley and Wordsworth and Keats; but one can hardly help believing that popular and critical indifference was chiefly responsible for the neglect. Now, however, that in this important particular he is receiving his own with interest, it may be well to take a nearer view of the rival editions. That of Mr. Murray is clearly the only one entitled to call itself complete: it is equally clear that he has been unfortunate in not securing Mr. Henley to edit it, with Mr. Prothero. The latter has done his work well; he prints eighty more letters for the same space of time than Mr. Henley; but, as he gracefully acknowledges, he cannot handle his materials in the attractive way his rival can. Mr. Henley's notes abound in errors, but they are almost as interesting as the letters he annotates,—which is saying a great deal; for Byron, with his dash, directness, and force, ranks near the very top of the world's great letter-writers.

Mr. Henley's editorial success has a twofold source—(1) his devotion to Byron, whom he considers to be "the sole English poet (for Sir Walter conquered in prose) bred since Milton to live a

[1] The Macmillan Company, New York. [2] Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

master influence in the world at large," and (2) his intimate knowledge of the England of the Regency, whose hidebound, but corrupt, society could tolerate Castlereagh and Yarmouth and the Prince himself, but drove Byron into exile. His knowledge and love of his subject are indeed so great that one would almost acknowledge him as an ideal editor, in spite of his talent for unscholarly, if trifling, blunders, did not one discover in his work a certain lack of refinement that is disturbing. For example, there was really no necessity for him to denominate Pierce Egan an "ass," or the quack that tortured Byron's foot an "ignorant brute." But, notwithstanding such blemishes and the normal assertiveness of his manner, there can be little doubt that Mr. Henley's will long be a most interesting edition of Byron for the general reader.

This is not to say, however, that the handsome Murray edition is valuable only because it is complete and, apparently, final. Mr. Prothero has annotated the letters most carefully; and I cannot agree with those critics who think that he should have cast aside some of his materials. There are comparatively few of the social notes and letters included that do not throw light on Byron's character; and nearly all are interesting. The latter statement cannot be made, of course, for the early poems, which Mr. Coleridge has annotated with scholarly thoroughness. It will take the verve of Mr. Henley's notes to make the "Hours of Idleness" go down. I have re-read these youthful verses: and the only pleasure I could get from them lay in the fact that the various readings collated by the new editor seemed to show that, on the whole, when Byron altered a verse, he improved it—whence I derived a vague, but perhaps vain, hope that succeeding volumes will enable us to think a little better of him as a technical artist than most of us, whether we admire him or not, are now able to do.

The eleven fresh poems printed by Mr. Coleridge do not help matters out in the least; but this need not take the relish from the news that fifteen stanzas of "Don Juan" and a fairly large fragment of the third part of "The Deformed Transformed" are to be given us in due season. It is a pity, from the point of view of those who intend to use this edition to re-read their Byron slowly, that the publishers did not wait until two volumes of the poetry were ready. Even the "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers," though it be admitted to be the best strictly literary satire between "The Dunciad" and "A Fable for Critics," cannot neutralize the deadly effect of the "Hours of Idleness" and give life to this first of the six volumes that are to contain Byron's poetry. I know of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no other poet of eminence who is so handicapped by his youthful verses. Others have written stuff as worthless, or even worse; but no other that I can recall has barred the way to his great achievements by such a mass of uniformly immature and mediocre work. This has been said and thought thousands of times, to be sure, since the "Edinburgh" printed its needlessly harsh critique and stung Byron's genius into life; but it does not seem to have suggested, either to editors or to publishers, the propriety, in popular editions at least, of beginning the poetical works with the "English Bards" and printing the early verses as an appendix. We are constantly laboring to facilitate approach to our poets, we compile volumes of selections, we introduce them and annotate them; yet we seldom adopt this easy and useful plan of putting their *impedimenta* in the rear.

But have these two editions stimulated a real Byron revival, or can any rearrangement of his works make him genuinely popular once more among English readers? I cannot, with the best wish to persuade myself, believe that any permanent reaction has as yet set in in his favor, nor am I at all confident that he will ever be read with the old enthusiasm by all classes of people. My reasons for these opinions cannot be given without some discussion of his much-mooted rank as a poet; but, as the point in question is one of real critical importance, and as the present is a particularly opportune time, I shall not shrink from taking part in what may seem at first thought to be a hopelessly involved controversy.

Byron, as we all know, was acknowledged by his contemporaries, both at home and abroad, to be the master poet of his generation. He has practically lost this position in the eyes of English-speaking peoples, but has kept it among Continental peoples. Taine and Castelar and Elze place him at the summit of poetic renown, much as Goethe did over seventy years ago. No Englishman, however, not even Matthew Arnold, writes of him as enthusiastically as Sir Walter Scott could do in all sincerity. The reaction against him set in shortly after his death, Carlyle giving it potent voice; and to-day Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, Tennyson, and Browning can count their partisans by scores, where Byron can count one.

Nor is it merely a question of his relative rank among nineteenth-century poets. Such critics as Mr. Swinburne, Mr. Saintsbury, and Mr. Lionel Johnson have practically denied him any standing at all as a great poet; and even his stanch admirers feel called upon to qualify their praise. When Arnold extolled him at the expense of Shelley, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

critics, great and little, took a professional pleasure in charging their leader with being for once thoroughly erratic.

Many reasons have been brought forward to account for this change of taste and opinion among Englishmen. Byron's enemies say that we are more clear-sighted than our grandfathers were, that we have stripped the masks from his *Laras* and *Conrads* and *Manfreds*, and exposed the tawdry pseudo-poet beneath; that we know better than to receive a traveller's versified note-book as an inspired poem; that, if he has any merit at all, it is merely as a satirist and a rhetorician. Less rabid critics call attention to the fact, that, after the strenuous Revolutionary period was over, Englishmen felt the need of calmer, more moral, and more artistic poetry, and that what was Tennyson's opportunity was naturally Byron's extremity. In a critical, neo-Alexandrian age, they say, the poet who wrote just as passion and impulse dictated can find no appreciative audience save among the semi-cultured. On the Continent the case is different, because foreigners are naturally blind to artistic defects that are patent to every Englishman, and Byron's force and passion can produce their legitimate effects unhindered, much as they did among our forefathers, who were living in a transitional poetic period, and were, moreover, dazzled by the fiery personality of the man.

There can be little doubt that the moderate views just given contain much that is true. I will go further and say, that they are practically the grounds on which I rest my belief that no genuine revival of Byron will be possible among us for a long time to come. We are, as a rule, too sophisticated, too Alexandrian in our tastes, to enjoy greatly poetry that is thrown off at a white heat, save perhaps, for variety, the ballads with which Mr. Kipling has been favoring us. We prefer the artistic, the carefully wrought; and, even so, we do not desire that the poet's art should be as strenuous as it is in "Paradise Lost." Until something stirs us up as a race, Byron is likely to be a favorite only with youths who are naturally passionate and with disillusioned men who can get pleasure out of wit and satire.

But reasons that apply to the mass of readers do not necessarily apply to critics and men of more than ordinary culture. Such persons ought to be able to rid themselves, to some extent, of the prejudices of their own age and to fit themselves to enjoy genuine poetic merit of every sort. If it be true that Byron possessed a splendid personality, the force, the passion, the sincerity of which have been transmitted to his work, it is a sign of weakness when the cultured man of to-day fails

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to enjoy these qualities, because, forsooth, he is offended by a false note here, a glaring patch of color there. There seems, too, to be an inherent weakness in our critical methods, if we can neglect, misunderstand, or treat with contempt a writer who was believed by his contemporaries to have dominated their age, and from whom foreigners have gathered literary inspiration for nearly a century. In other words, while there may be good reason to believe that a popular reaction in Byron's favor is not to be looked for shortly, is there any reason to believe that a majority of our critics and men of culture must continue to keep their faces turned away from him, as seems to be the case at present?

I am inclined to answer, No. Byron's case with the critics is by no means so hopeless as the comparative failure of Matthew Arnold's defence of him would seem to prove. This is, on the whole, an age in which criticism is in the hands of impressionists and scholars; that is to say, most men who write about literary matters are critics of taste or critics of knowledge. Above these two classes, unifying and correlating their respective qualities, are to be found the critics of judgment, who are naturally not numerous at any period. Matthew Arnold belonged to this last class; and some of his judgments, particularly those relating to Byron and Shelley, were unintelligible to Mr. Swinburne and Mr. Saintsbury, among others, simply because, as critics of taste and of knowledge, respectively, they were better fitted to play the advocate than to judge. Now judgment has always characterized the Continental critics, especially the French, more than it has the English; and when we find men like Taine, Elze, and Castelar practically agreeing in their estimates of Byron, it ought to make us pause. A cultivated taste means much; wide and accurate knowledge means much: but the impressionists and scholars have between them managed to get English criticism into an almost anarchical state; and the time is probably not far distant when the higher claims of the critics of judgment will be acknowledged with relief, even at the risk of the establishment of a dictatorial power like that of Dr. Johnson. Such a dogmatic reign as his will not, of course, be seen again; but chaos at least will not be long tolerated. And when anarchy ends among the critics, Byron may come once more into favor, for the following reasons, which I submit not as my own,—that would be presumptuous in view of what I have just written,—but as gathered by me from my reading of the critics, and tested by a recent reperusal of the whole of Byron's poetical work.

Mr. Henley calls Byron the "voice-in-chief" of his generation; and such was the opinion of contemporaries like Sir Walter Scott and Shel-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ley. Hatred of established conventions, political, religious, and social; love for nature in her wilder aspects; romantic fervor in personal attachments; lack of reticence in the expression of emotions,—in short, a fervid individualism, may be said to have been the leavening characteristics of the age; and they plainly received their fullest utterance in Byron's poetry. He may, therefore, be called legitimately the poet of an age; but we should not pay him the honors due to this high class of poets until we have measured him with Dante or Shakespeare or Milton, and determined whether he is also a poet for all time. His present obscuration does not absolve us from this comparison; for there have been times when even Dante's fame has been somewhat obscured in Italy.

The immediate effects of such a comparison cannot but be disastrous to Byron. He has not the high moral earnestness of Dante or Milton; he has not their intellectual scope; he has not their invariably perfect style. Whether as man or poet, he is at once seen to be far their inferior; and, if we were to confine our attention to his conduct or to his marvellously erratic judgments about men and books, it would seem to be an impertinence to mention his name along with those of such consummate masters. Yet he voiced the best of his age, and possessed a personality of transcendent force. Are we, therefore, quite sure that the comparison we are instituting is unnecessary? Have we not omitted to consider some essential element?

We have. The great poets, "not of an age, but for all time," have all left masterpieces in which their genius has taken a long and sustained flight,—masterpieces each in its way unapproachable. Has Byron left any such? He has, in "Don Juan," and its pendants, "Beppo" and "The Vision of Judgment." These great poems are, to be sure, vastly inferior to "The Divine Comedy," "Othello," and "Paradise Lost"; but "Don Juan," at least, is akin to them in being a work of sustained poetic imagination, perfect of its sort, unapproachable, and perennially fresh. It voices its author and his age; it is *sui generis*, the greatest of humorous epics, couched in a style that could not be changed except for the worse, and unique in its combination of wit, humor, and satire with a genuine and rich vein of romantic and descriptive poetry. It is, in my opinion, the single sustained work of poetic imagination produced in nineteenth-century England that keeps a level flight, the only one written in a style and verse-form as absolutely appropriated by its author as English blank verse is by Milton, the Latin hexameter by Vergil, and the Romantic Alexandrine by Victor Hugo. I will go further and say, that, to me at least, it is the single long poem in Eng-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lish since "Paradise Lost" that grows fresher with each reading and that gives me the sense of being in the presence of a spirit of almost boundless capacity. If this spirit does not soar into the heaven of heavens, it at least never falls to earth (save from the point of view of morals), but preserves a strong and middle flight.

What has just been claimed for "Don Juan" is practically what many critics have seen and said; but they have not, as a rule, made sufficient use of Byron's masterpiece to connect him with the great world-poets on the one hand, or to separate him, on the other, from his English contemporaries and successors. Elze, indeed, has placed him in a supreme position as representing "lyrical verse conceived in its widest sense as subjective poetry" ("die Lyrik im weitesten Sinne als subjective Poesie aufgefasst"); but this is a rather dangerous stand to take, both because the great world-poets have not won their position by their lyrical work, and because Byron's lyrical efforts, whether in a technical or a broader sense, are often so faulty that to proclaim him as a supreme lyrist is practically to assert that he was a great poet because he was a great personality. It is safer to argue that the poets of the highest class are always represented by sustained masterpieces, and that "Don Juan" is sufficiently such a work to warrant our placing its author, who also voiced the aspirations of his age and was a tremendous personality, among the world-poets, but beneath them all in rank.

Applying now this "masterpiece" test to the much-disputed question of Byron's relative position among the English poets of this century, we must perhaps conclude that even Matthew Arnold has not made sufficient use of it. He has had a discerning eye for the beauty and value of the poetical passages scattered profusely through Byron's works, just as he has had for the similar passages in Wordsworth; but he has seemingly failed to consider architectonics, and has thus given the palm to Wordsworth on the just score of the superior quality of the latter's work when at its best. But where is Wordsworth's indisputable sustained masterpiece? Even the "Ode on the Intimations of Immortality" has serious competitors, and, with all its beauty and power, does not connect its author with the world-poets. "The Excursion" has not won its way in England yet, much less on the Continent; and he would be a rash Wordsworthian who should assert that it ever will. And what have Keats and Coleridge to show in the way of masterpieces, such as we are considering? What has Shelley, whose "Prometheus Unbound" and "The Cenci," though in some respects won-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

derful, are neither fully unique nor representative? As for the "Idylls of the King" and "The Ring and the Book," one can merely say, that they are still under the fire of the critics, and that the former, at least, is not likely to be pronounced unique or masterful, except by persons who know little about other heroic poetry.

According to the above reasoning, if the serried hosts of the partisans of other poets will allow the word to pass, it would seem that Byron is connected with the world-poets in three respects: (1) He has written a sustained masterpiece; (2) he is a representative character who has been accepted by the world at large; and (3) he possesses a tremendously powerful personality. No other modern Englishman is so connected with the world-poets; but Byron himself falls below them in respect to the inferior nature of his masterpiece and of his own moral, intellectual, and artistic qualifications. Yet there is also another, though a secondary, feature of his work that binds him to the masters, and distinguishes him from most of his contemporaries and successsors—I mean the wide scope taken by his versatility. A discussion of this point will naturally lead us to take a rapid survey of his entire poetical achievement.

Passing over the "Hours of Idleness," it is to be noted that as early as 1808 Byron was capable of a fine lyric. "When We Two Parted" dates from this year, and breathes a spirit of passionate sorrow hardly equalled in literature; yet the major part of the lyrics of this and the next few years cannot be said to be of a high order. There are some good occasional verses, and "Maid of Athens," "I Enter thy Garden of Roses," "There be None of Beauty's Daughters," rank very high; the last-named being fully worthy of Shelley at his best: but, although the general level of the "Hours of Idleness" is surpassed, no solid foundation for fame has yet been laid, even if the verve of the "English Bards" be taken into account. In 1812 the stanzas to Thyrza, beginning, "And thou art dead, as young and fair," showed what Byron might do in the elegy if he had a mind; and in 1815 the "Hebrew Melodies," with their one supreme lyric ("She Walks in Beauty"), and at least three admirable songs, gave anyone the right to expect great things of him as a lyrist. A little later his domestic troubles occasioned the writing of "Fare Thee Well," and the three poems addressed to Augusta; but, after the later cantos of "Childe Harold," the dramas, the final tales, and "Don Juan" began to occupy his mind, lyrical work became a matter of minor importance. He did not eschew it, of course; for "Manfred" and other dramatic poems required it; and here and there he wrote an excellent,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

though hardly a perfect, song. Even in "Don Juan" he made room for the eloquent "Isles of Greece"; and at Missolonghi itself he composed those stanzas on his thirty-sixth birthday which will be forgotten only when men cease to remember the nobly pathetic death that soon after befell him.

Taken in its totality, his lyric work must rank far below that of Shelley and Burns, to name no others; but it requires little critical discernment to perceive that he was capable of pushing any of his rivals close, if he had cared to put forth his full powers. It is idle to affirm that the man who wrote some of the doggerel in "Heaven and Earth" could never have been a true lyrist. The aberrations of men of genius, even of almost consummate artists, are not to be accounted for; and there are things perilously near doggerel in the mature work of poets like Shelley and Tennyson. Byron's aberrations in the matter of bad lyrical work are probably more distressing than those of any other great poet; but they are to be accounted for rather by the restlessness of his temperament than by his native incapacity to write a true song. He was much besides a lyric poet; but in gauging his versatility we must not overlook his undeveloped, but genuine, gift for singing, nor the absolute worth of at least a score of his lyrics.

Byron's contemporary fame took firm root with the publication of the first two cantos of "Childe Harold" in 1812. It is difficult now to understand how he could "awake and find himself famous" for such far from supreme work; but we must remember that people had had time to grow somewhat weary of Sir Walter's metrical romances of Scotland, and that the day had not come for popular appreciation of Wordsworth. And the first cantos of "Harold," with all their affectations and imperfections, have many decided merits which are still visible in this day of reaction against them. The invocation to the second canto, and such passages as that beginning, "Fair Greece, sad relic of departed worth," will attract readers long after Mr. Swinburne's contemptuous depreciation of the entire poem shall have been forgotten. Then, too, there is a foreshadowing of the descriptive power that was to make the third and fourth cantos memorable. In short, although Byron needed to work off his crude energies in the Eastern tales, to be disgusted with the licentious and frivolous society of the Regency, and to be stirred to the depths by his domestic turmoils, before his genius could be fully roused, there were abundant signs of the existence of that genius from the moment that Scott, with a prudent magnanimity, abdicated the throne of verse in his favor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Eastern tales that followed in quick succession, "The Giaour," "The Bride of Abydos," "The Corsair," and "Lara," naturally increased his reputation, because they were eminently readable and because they seemed to be partly autobiographic. None knew what the wild young peer had done in the East; therefore, everyone read the tales and speculated. The Byronic hero became quite a social personage,—a fact which has since led to not a little depreciation of this portion of the poet's works. We are now told that "The Giaour" is the only one of the early tales possessing a spark of life; and, while this is an exaggeration, it is impossible to deny that it was a good thing for Byron's fame when, by rapid working, he exhausted his Eastern vein. "The Bride" and "The Corsair," however, contain several passages of imperishable beauty; and, much as the mystery and gloom of "Lara" may be out of fashion, it is hardly fair to deny the power and the literary influence of that romance in the couplets of Pope. And besides the poetical passages, there was a vigor of narration that somewhat made up for the marked poverty of characterization, and that preluded the more successful later tales and the supreme achievement of "Don Juan." Indeed, Byron must have felt that he had a faculty for narration, since he wrote "The Island" as late as 1823.

"The Siege of Corinth" and "Parisina" appeared shortly after his marriage; while "The Prisoner of Chillon" and "Mazeppa" date respectively from 1816 and 1818. His mental and artistic growth was distinctly revealed in these pieces, the third of which has become classical. Although "The Siege" ends badly and contains much crude work, it is memorable for its descriptive strength; and there are some passages and scenes in both "Parisina" and "Mazeppa" that will perish only with the language. Even "The Island," which has been declared to be a total failure by so well-disposed a critic as Mr. J. A. Symonds, is such only in the first canto. It manages to throw a kind of Chateaubriand glamour over the South Sea Islands, and proves that, even after its author's hand had become subdued to the far from sentimental materials of "Don Juan," it had not entirely lost its early cunning in romantic narrative. We must, therefore, conclude, in despite of the critics, that Byron's tales count for something in his life-work, and are another proof of his wonderful versatility.

It is worth while to note, that, just as the unfairness of his early critics stimulated Byron to achieve the first stage of his fame, so the clamors of society against him after his rupture with his wife incited him to the still higher achievement represented by the third and fourth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cantos of "Childe Harold." The poet has now practically become another man, and has transported his readers to a new world. His intellectual grasp has become firmer and larger; his artistic powers have been strengthened and chastened, though not to the height of perfection; and his emotions and passions have been keyed to a point of intensity almost unparalleled. The result is a series of marvellous passages, which need only structural unity to make them a great poem. The Spirit of Nature has seized hold upon him, not through the influence of Wordsworth, as some suppose, but because of native propensity and enforced disgust with the world of men; and he rises to the supreme heights of descriptive poetry. Some of his stanzas devoted to the Alps are fairly sublime with passion. He does not penetrate Nature, as Wordsworth does: he appropriates her. And he almost manages to move without tripping over the fields of history and criticism, usually so foreign to him. He can characterize Rousseau and Gibbon, can comprehend the past of Italy and Rome, and can fairly conquer his normal ineptitude in matters of art. As for the noble and exquisite land in which he was to spend his exile, he almost appropriates her as he does Nature. The Italy of "Childe Harold," whatever artistic blemishes that poem may have, has dominated the world, certainly the English portion of it, in a manner not equalled by the subtler work of Landor or Shelley or Browning. It is this Italy that reappears in "Parisina," in "Beppo," in "The Lament of Tasso," in "The Prophecy of Dante," in the "Ode on Venice," in certain of the dramas—and lends charm to them all. "The Lament of Tasso" has, indeed, a power all its own that forestalls Browning and that makes one question why it is not more highly esteemed; but "The Two Foscari" would be almost unreadable save for the passages that describe its hero's passion for Venice, loveliest of cities.

We can now see that the later narrative and descriptive work not only furnishes fresh proof of Byron's astonishing versatility, but would suffice, without "Don Juan," to give its author a very high, though perhaps not the supreme, position among the English poets of this century. But the entire dramatic section of his writings, including no less than eight lyrical dramas and tragedies, remains to be considered.

It is usual to dismiss most of this work with positive contempt; but I, at least, must agree with Dr. Garnett in believing that he has, "like Dryden, produced memorable works by force and flexibility of genius." I will go further and say, that, after having just re-read them all, I should prefer to begin immediately to read them over again to being forced to go through once more the entire dramatic work of Ten-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nyson or Browning. I am well aware that Byron's blank verse is often execrable, whether through his carelessness or his incapacity to handle that measure; I know that only that precious product of open plunder, "Werner," succeeded on the stage; I admit that Byron's genius was essentially non-dramatic, that his chief characters are not real persons, but ideal personages;—I admit almost anything, in short, except the claim that the dramas are total, or nearly total, failures. Nearly all carry interest; all show force and versatility; not one is lacking in passages of passion; and at least three are, with all their faults, productions not to be matched in the works of any of Byron's modern rivals, save Shelley. These three are "Manfred," "Cain," and "Sardanapalus," which may be set beside the "Prometheus Unbound" and "The Cenci." The British critics have almost unanimously rendered their verdict in favor of Shelley; and, from the point of view of technical art, they are doubtless in the right. Yet I question whether the sheer vigor of Byron does not balance the art of Shelley in a class of compositions in which neither could attain perfection.

But, when the dramas have been added to the lyrical, narrative, and descriptive work, to vindicate Byron's claim to be considered the most versatile poetic genius of modern England, we are brought full upon the masterpiece which of itself alone might suffice to prove the truth of this claim, that wonderful "Don Juan," almost the only modern poem of which, adapting Shakespeare, it may be said, "Age cannot wither it nor custom stale its infinite variety." I shall say little more about it, save to remark that its poetical passages have a *richer* tone than can easily be found elsewhere in Byron's own work or in that of his rivals, and that its fierce denunciation and irresistible ridicule of cant and tyranny ought to make it and its pendant, "The Vision of Judgment," almost, if not quite, the master poems of modern democracy. Byron was a revolted aristocrat, it is true; but his acquired sympathy with democratic ideals, especially those of America, became a liberalizing force that can hardly be overpraised and should never be forgotten. We, at least, the countrymen of the Washington he extolled, should not be ungrateful to his memory; and the advocates of peace among the nations should hail him as their most effective champion.

But the reader may ask, What has become of the vicious, the irreligious Byron of our forefathers—the author of the blasphemous "Cain" and the licentious "Don Juan," which no self-respecting man ought to read? An obvious answer to this question would be the statement, that he never existed, save in the heated imaginations of his well-mean-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing, but unintelligent, countrymen. Such an answer, however, would smack partly of disingenuousness. It is true that the "monster of wickedness" never existed; but it is also true that Byron, by his conduct and his writings, sketched the outlines of a caricature which his countrymen had only to fill in. The high praise I have just given him as an apostle of liberty and peace is thoroughly deserved; and he died a martyr for freedom. But his life was in many important respects unworthy and low; his character was soiled by traits of vulgarity and vice; and his writings were often impure. Time has naturally softened us toward him; and study of him and his age has convinced us that there was far more of good than of bad in him, that much extenuation can be found for his conduct and the impurity of his writings: but, while we judge the man as leniently as we can, it would not be just to ourselves if we were to make as much allowance for his literary work, the influence of which lives on. We may, indeed, easily dismiss the charge of blasphemy; for the word has various meanings at various periods and to various orders of intelligence. Byron did not mean to be blasphemous; and his attitude toward Christianity is at most wavering, not positively sceptical or defiant. To eschew his poetry on this account, in an age that tolerates Mrs. Humphry Ward, would be little short of ridiculous in any person of even semi-culture.

The charge of impurity cannot be dismissed so easily, although it would hardly be raised against a foreign writer. Some of his earliest verse was suppressed, on account of its tone, by his kind friend, Rev. Mr. Beecher. In the lyrical and narrative work written before his marriage he kept this vein under, but did not manage, and probably did not wish, to hide its existence. In the better portions of "Childe Harold," in the dramas, even in such later tales as "Parisina," it would require a prying purist to find anything seriously objectionable. In "Beppo" and "Don Juan," however, he gave himself a loose rein, in spite of the importunities of La Guiccioli. He took delight in shocking the sense of propriety of his countrymen, who had treated him with injustice; but, while his heartiest admirers cannot but wish that he had not gone so far, they find in this very fact not only an excuse for him, but a safe means of rescuing the two poems from the mass of objectionable literature. Certain scenes and passages of "Don Juan" are not deliberate efforts to corrupt: they are rather the ebullitions of a coarse, but thoroughly sincere, satirist, bent on shocking people he despises. The wit, the verve, the humor, the satire that are explicit or implicit in almost every stanza save "Don Juan" as by fire.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The London of the Regency naturally could not take this view of the matter, and sought to drown its own shame in the clamor that it raised over the alleged immorality of the new poem; but choice and wholesome spirits, like Sir Walter Scott, saw that Byron had struck his true vein, and cheered him on. As the cantos proceeded, he held himself in more and more, so that much of the poem is practically unamenable to censure. And now that time has removed us as far from him as he was from Fielding, it would seem that only those who are peculiarly sensitive to the coarse, and peculiarly insensitive to wit, need be warned away from the greatest masterpiece of its kind in any literature.

In short, just as an age that tolerates Mrs. Ward need not fear that Byron will sap its faith, so an age that reads without abhorrence certain chapters in "The Manxman," in "Jude the Obscure," and in "Evelyn Innes," cannot with consistency put "Don Juan" beyond the pale. Nor should an age that admires brilliant achievements of all kinds long withhold its praise from that wonderfully passionate, strong, and sincere soul which, after uttering itself in the master poem and poetry of a tremendous epoch, gave itself up a willing sacrifice to the cause of human freedom in the fatal marshes of Missolonghi. W. P. TRENT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED